

TENNESSEE.

Robert A. Espey to be postmaster at Bellbuckle, Bedford County, Tenn., in place of Reuben C. Couch. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1907.

Richard N. Hudson to be postmaster at Sweetwater, Monroe County, Tenn., in place of James M. Pardue. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1907.

Finis R. Sharp to be postmaster at Manchester, Coffee County, Tenn., in place of Euclid W. Smartt, jr., resigned.

Charles D. Wilkinson to be postmaster at Pulaski, Giles County, Tenn., in place of William B. Farris. Incumbent's commission expired November 23, 1907.

TEXAS.

Wesley J. Clarke to be postmaster at Dalhart, Dallam County, Tex., in place of Wesley J. Clarke. Incumbent's commission expires January 27, 1908.

W. P. Harris to be postmaster at Sulphur Springs, Hopkins County, Tex., in place of William C. Hurley. Incumbent's commission expires January 27, 1908.

Jesse H. Harrison to be postmaster at Daingerfield, Morris County, Tex. Office became Presidential January 1, 1908. (Postmaster resigned.)

WASHINGTON.

Robert O'Neil to be postmaster at Lynden, Whatcom County, Wash. Office became Presidential January 1, 1907.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 7, 1908.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

William Balderston to be register of the land office at Boise, Idaho.

POSTMASTERS.

MONTANA.

Charles A. Peterson to be postmaster at Plains, Sanders County, Mont.

OKLAHOMA.

Albert S. Yates to be postmaster at Texhoma, in the county of Beaver and State of Oklahoma.

WISCONSIN.

Daniel E. Frost to be postmaster at Stevens Point, Portage County, Wis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 7, 1908.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. SLEMP to the Committee on Accounts and also to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GREENE, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for one week, on account of illness.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the reference of House resolution 115 was changed from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on Rules.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages, in writing, from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. LATTA, one of his secretaries.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. FRANCIS RIVER IN ARKANSAS.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 194) to authorize the county of St. Francis, in the State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across St. Francis River at or near the town of Madison in said county and State.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Arkansas if this has been reported by a committee?

Mr. MACON. It has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the contract is already let for the construction of the bridge.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MACON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the President's message and also the resolution distributing it.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. OVERSTREET in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House resolution No. 43.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the resolution has not been read, and I ask that it be read.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House resolution 43.

Resolved, That so much of the annual message of the President of the United States to the two Houses of Congress at the present session as relates to the revenue and the bonded debt of the United States be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

That so much as relates to the appropriations of the public revenue for support of the Government as herein provided, namely, for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses; for sundry civil expenses; for fortifications and coast defenses; for pensions; for the District of Columbia, and for all deficiencies be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

That so much as relates to the judiciary of the United States, to the administration of justice, to the punishment and prevention of crime, and to the organization of courts be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

That so much as relates to banks and banking and the currency be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

That so much as relates to commerce and the Isthmian Canal be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

That so much as relates to the improvement of rivers and harbors be referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

That so much as relates to the merchant marine and fisheries be referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

That so much as relates to agriculture, and appropriations therefor, and to forestry be referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

That so much as relates to the foreign affairs, the consular and diplomatic service, including appropriations therefor, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

That so much as relates to the military establishment, and appropriations therefor, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

That so much as relates to the naval establishment and to the construction of additional vessels for the Navy, and appropriations therefor, be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

That so much as relates to the post-office and post-roads and to the carrying of the foreign mails, and appropriations therefor, be referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

That so much as relates to the public domain be referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

That so much as relates to the relations of the United States to the Indian tribes, and appropriations therefor, be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

That so much as relates to the Territories, Alaska, and the Hawaiian Islands be referred to the Committee on the Territories.

That so much as relates to the islands which came to the United States through the treaty of 1899 with Spain (except so much as relates to the revenue and the appropriations) be referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

That so much as relates to the mining interests be referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

That so much as relates to the levees of the Mississippi River be referred to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

That so much as relates to education be referred to the Committee on Education.

That so much as relates to labor be referred to the Committee on Labor.

That so much as relates to the affairs of the District of Columbia (excepting appropriations) be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

That so much as relates to reform in the civil service be referred to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

That so much as relates to the election of the President, Vice-President, or Representatives in Congress be referred to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

That so much as relates to the irrigation of arid lands be referred to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

That so much as relates to statuary and pictures be referred to the Joint Committee on the Library.

That so much as relates to the census be referred to the Committee on the Census.

That so much as relates to the industrial arts and expositions other than revenue and appropriations be referred to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, this is the usual resolution for the distribution of the various subjects and contents in the President's message to the appropriate committees of the House under the rule. Having said that much, I have said all that there is to say in regard to it. It is unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means. If any gentleman desires to ask any questions in regard to it, I will be glad to answer, if I can.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some understanding about the speech making. That is a plain way of putting it.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I have not been asked by any gentleman on this side of the House for any time. I propose to reserve the balance of my own time if there are no questions to be asked, and I will then yield to any gentleman on the other side who desires to take the floor in his own right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to control half of the time.

Mr. SHERMAN. But no agreement of that kind has been made as yet.

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest that the gentleman take the floor for an hour in his own right and that we arrange the matter afterwards.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But I do not want to make any remarks myself. There are several gentleman over here, however, who are not unwilling to do so. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman asks unanimous consent I shall not object to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Very well. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to control half the time.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, there has been no time fixed for debate, and there could not be any arrangement to control half the time. The gentleman can have an hour in his own right. Half the time would mean all the rest of the session.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, I understand that perfectly well.

Mr. PAYNE. I desire to say to the gentleman from Missouri that the time is without limit, and I think there will be no difficulty in getting all the time that he wants on that side of the House—of course, subject to the coming in of other business perhaps more important even than debate on this question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I desire to yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SHEPPARD.

Mr. PAYNE. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves the balance of his time, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri, who yields thirty minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My inquiry is this: Can we agree on time in the committee, or do we have to go back into the House to make that agreement?

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent the committee may fix the limits of the debate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me by unanimous consent, then, that somebody on this side ought to control half of the time and somebody on the other side control the other half of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Missouri that that arrangement is desirable where there is pressure for time, but where there seems to be abundance of time it is not necessary. However, the committee has the power by unanimous consent to fix the time of debate. The gentleman from Missouri will understand further that under the existing conditions the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] having been first recognized and being entitled to an hour, and reserving the remainder of his time, the Chair has now recognized the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who is entitled to an hour.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield thirty minutes of that hour to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas for thirty minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I rise, Mr. Chairman, without partisan feeling or purpose briefly to submit the reasons which prompted me to introduce at the opening of the present session a bill providing that the words, "In God We Trust," should be retained upon the coins of the United States. On recent issues of gold coins designed by the late Augustus St. Gaudens this striking sentence, so expressive of American reverence and faith, has been omitted by order of President Roosevelt. It may be interesting to refer here to the circumstances under which this motto was first inscribed upon our coinage. In November, 1861, when the foundations of the Republic were shaking, a Pennsylvania minister warned the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Salmon P. Chase, that if the nation should perish no evidence of the religious faith of its inhabitants would be preserved upon its coins. Impressed by the minister's appeal, the Secretary of the Treasury, affirming that no nation could be strong except in the strength of God or safe except in His defense, and that the trust of the American people in God should be declared on the national coin, requested the Director of the Mint to prepare a device "with a motto expressing in the fewest and tersest words possible this national recognition." It was discovered that legislation would be necessary, as the act of January, 1837, prescribed the mottoes and devices for our coins. In April, 1864, in March, 1865, and in February, 1873, Congress enacted laws providing in substance that the words, "In God we trust," might be inscribed upon such coins as would admit of such motto.

Mr. Chairman, Congress ought not to permit this legend to be stricken from the coinage. The American people are fundamentally a religious people. They are distinguished by a devotion to religious and civil freedom. Perhaps every form of religious thought is represented among us and yet we are one in the recognition of a supreme and all-wise God. The opportunity to worship the omnipotent Father according to the conscience of the individual is the basis of American history, the corner-stone of the American Commonwealth. There is an essential relation between God and freedom. Liberty as a permanent prerogative of the people was for all practical purposes an impossible conception before Abraham's proclamation of the one all-seeing God. After this proclamation men who had worshipped kings and idols came soon to realize that the God of the spirit was the only rightful sovereign. They came soon to understand that with the same spiritual Father men were brothers both here and hereafter. It followed immediately that men were spiritual and political equals, and liberty, equality, fraternity, dawned upon the human race. Thus God is the source of liberty and religious freedom the basis of political independence. Voltaire, the scoffer, the satirist, but above all the analyst profound, expressed this truth with evident application to the American Republic when raising his withered hands above the grandson of Benjamin Franklin who had besought for the youth the aged philosopher's benediction, he whispered, "God and Liberty." It was the idea of the one God and the resultant conception of human brotherhood that made the Hebrew nation the world's first self-governing commonwealth and enabled it to embody the highest religious and civic ideals six centuries before Greece knew an alphabet and more than a thousand years before the Latins founded Rome.

These principles were the basis of the Mosaic code, a code which is to-day the framework of civilization and government, a code which enters elementally into the civil and criminal codes of all modern states, a code which taught the elevation of woman, the love of home, the sanctity of property and life, the observance of the Sabbath, charity, fraternity, representative government, systematic education, contempt for luxury and extravagance, equal rights and rigid justice. These principles have made the Hebrew commonwealth a model and a light in the reformations, awakenings, and revolutions of the world. In the American Revolution arguments in behalf of independence and against all despotism were liberally drawn from Judaic literature and teaching. Throughout the colonies the Hebrew nation was cited as the ideal republic. On the day the Continental Congress declared our independence Franklin, Adams, and Jefferson were appointed to prepare a seal for the United States and for a device they selected a representation of Moses watching the Red Sea as it enveloped Pharaoh, adding beneath the picture the words, "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God." It is of more than human import that the Hebrew commonwealth, embodying the ideas of God and liberty, was the chief example of the American patriots and that the United States, representing in the spirit underlying its institutions the Hebrew nation more closely than does any other country, was the first government since the final destruction of Jerusalem, seventeen hun-

dred years before, under which the Hebrew people were admitted to unrestricted and coequal citizenship.

The beginnings of the United States were essentially religious, and a divine purpose may be seen in the events which made possible our country and its institutions. Surely there was omnipotent design in the fact that the invention of printing, the discovery of America, and the European Reformation took place within the same century. The printing press brought the Bible to the people, and they rose from the serfdom of ages to stand before God as untrammelled children; before each other as brothers and as equals. With the Reformation began the movement to free the soul, the brain, the arm of man—a movement which culminated on this hemisphere in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Despotism was assailed, and wars, commotions, persecutions raged through Europe. That this movement might reach fruition in a new world undisturbed by the errors and oppressions of the old, God pointed the frail caravels of Columbus to these virgin shores. It was of more significance than even Columbus dreamed that on landing at Salvador his first act was to kneel upon the soil and dedicate the infant continent to the King of Kings. Thus under the especial favor of Providence America began. I now propose to show that the finger of God may be traced in every crisis of American history and that the dominant note of American character has been an unflinching trust in the wisdom and the justice of Omnipotence. [Applause.]

It is worthy of remark that every effort to exploit this country for sordid ends failed utterly; the adventurers in search of gold and notoriety came to grief. On the contrary, the valiant spirits who braved the trackless tides, the storms, the savages, the snows to establish in America a government of the free, who fled religious and political oppression to erect upon these shores the altars of religious and political liberty—the Puritan, the Huguenot, the Catholic, the Quaker, the Walloon, the Waldensian, the Covenanters, the Lutheran, the Cavalier, the Dissenter, the Highlander, the Moravian, the Jew; in fact, the hosts of earth's exiled and earth's wronged—flourished here under difficulties so tremendous, such pestilences, famines, massacres, and dissensions, that their preservation and advancement can be attributed to no other source than the God whose worship they came to maintain in its original purity, whose freedom they were to transmit to posterity and eternity. [Applause.] Before commencing each day's work the colonists at Jamestown assembled in the little church to invoke the blessings of Jehovah. "Doubt not," they wrote their friends at home, "God will raise our state and build His church in this excellent clime." When in 1619 the house of burgesses, the first legislative body in America, was established in this colony one of its first resolutions was a recognition of God. When the little congregation of John Robinson in the north of England was driven by the minions and measures of intolerance to Holland to become immortal pilgrims in the cause of liberty and the truth they were animated by a deathless trust in God.

Before landing on Massachusetts soil, after leaving Holland, they paused to compose upon the *Mayflower* our first written Constitution, and they began that remarkable document in the name of God. The first sentence summarizes the doctrines of God and freedom on which American institutions rest. Throughout colonial times the fires of faith and brotherhood were kept ablaze by Higginson, Hooker, Elliot, Mayhew, Williams, Davenport, Fox, Penn, Barclay, Keith, Whitfield, the Wesleys, Edwards, and other champions of an unshackled gospel, an unshackled manhood. They originated the religious revivals which have become so splendid a feature of American life. The first work of the first printing press in America, established in 1639, was a metrical version of the Psalms.

The life of Washington, the buttress of the Republic in its most perilous emergencies, shows instance after instance of divine intervention. One of the most notable of these was his preservation during the slaughter of Braddock's troops on the Monongahela in the French and Indian war. So marvelous was his escape that he at once accredited it to the Almighty. Writing his brother, Augustine, he said: "By the all-powerful dispensation of Providence, I have been protected beyond all human probability or expectation; for I had four bullets through my coat, two horses shot under me, yet escaped unhurt, though death was leveling my companions on every side around me." Indeed, his survival excited universal comment. One of the foremost clergymen of the time, Rev. Samuel Davies, voiced the general opinion when he referred to Washington, in a sermon shortly after Braddock's defeat, as "that heroic youth, Colne Washington, whom I can not but hope Providence has

hitherto preserved in so signal a manner for some important service to his country." [Applause.]

The first Continental Congress, with the assembling of which the Revolution morally began, was opened with prayer. On the second day the distinguished body met under the disturbing influence of a rumored bombardment of Boston. Indignation was on every brow, sympathy in every heart. The thirty-fifth Psalm, wherein David recites his wrongs and cries out for the shield and buckler of the Lord, was read by the Chaplain with such fervor and such effect that he broke into a thrilling prayer for the colonists and that John Adams afterwards expressed the belief that Heaven had ordained this passage to be read that morning. When the Chaplain concluded there was the silence of death. Then rose Patrick Henry, and under the impulse of that tremendous moment exclaimed in part: "The distinctions between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, New Yorkers, and New Englanders are no more. I am not a Virginian, but an American." [Applause.] With that sentence, inspired by more than human surroundings, the birth of American citizenship was complete, the germ of the American Republic was in flower. During the following year Henry expressed a similar sentiment when in his memorable address before the Virginia Revolutionary convention he said that there was a just God who would raise up friends to fight the battles of the colonists and welcomed liberty or death.

Ethan Allen crowded American history into a single sentence when he demanded the surrender of Ticonderoga in the name of the Great Jehovah and the Continental Congress. On Cambridge Common, the day before Bunker Hill, we see the president of Harvard praying among our troops. The colonists began the American revolution with prayer, and before the war was over the British, too, had learned to pray. [Applause.] On assuming command of the Continental Armies, Washington expressed the most unqualified confidence in the Deity. So desperate was the situation at the onset of a struggle between a fledgling nation and one of the foremost powers of the earth, such the destitution, lack of discipline, lack of numbers among the colonials, that Washington wrote a friend in confidence: "We are now left with a good deal less than half-raised regiments and about 5,000 militia. * * * If I shall be able to rise superior to these and many other difficulties which might be enumerated, I shall most religiously believe that the finger of Providence is in it to blind the eyes of our enemies." Can we doubt the partiality of the Creator when we recall the unspeakable suffering, the disparity of strength, the bitter winters, the ragged uniforms, the bloody prints of shoeless feet, the poverty of state and individual, the inherent weakness of government, the treacheries and intrigues through which the patriot cause ascended to consummate victory?

Can we question the especial aid of the Ruler of all Worlds when we see the fog refuse to rise that August morning in 1776 until our army had retreated from almost certain annihilation on Long Island, and then some five years later observe the dawning daylight drive the escaping Cornwallis back to Yorktown and surrender? Can we deny the interposition of Divinity when in the gloomiest hours of the conflict we see the tattered Continentals retreat barefooted over frozen roads, crossing, when almost overtaken, the Catawba and the Yadkin, whose waters successively rose to delay their pursuers? Is it strange that after the decisive victory of Yorktown the Continental Congress immediately proceeded to a church and, after expressing public thanks to God, proclaimed a day of national thanksgiving, in which the entire country joined most fervently? Is it strange that Washington, on surrendering his commission, deemed it an imperative duty to commend the nation to the continued protection of Omnipotence?

As the first act of Columbus on American soil was a recognition of Providence, it was remarkably fitting that nearly three centuries later the first act of the First Congress under the present system, after hearing the inaugural address of Washington, which glowed with expressions of gratitude to Heaven, was to assemble in a church and there unite in supplication to the Lord of all. Before the adjournment of that initial session Congress requested the President to recommend a "day of public thanksgiving and prayer, in acknowledgment of the many signal favors of Almighty God, and especially His affording the people an opportunity peaceably to establish a constitutional government for their safety and happiness." De Tocqueville, the great French historian and philosopher, who wrote the most accurate and remarkable analysis of American character yet given to mankind, observed after visiting the United States in the first half of the last century: "It never must be forgotten that religion gave birth to Anglo-American society." It is hardly possible to dissociate the miraculous

growth of the American Republic in population, in territory, in material and spiritual strength, in world influence, and importance from the cooperation of an agency more than mortal.

Especially is this true when we consider the questions of internal policy which, after threatening the existence of the country for seventy years, were not permanently settled until the altars of a reunited country had been christened in the blood of brothers.

When in the exciting hours of the Clay compromise of 1850 the strife of contending factions was angriest, Benton, his turbulence for once subdued, said, concerning the solution of the pending problem: "It seems to be above human reason. But there is a wisdom above human, and to that we must look." On leaving his home at Springfield in February, 1861, for the assumption of the Presidency, when the signs of the storm through which he was to guide the imperiled nation were everywhere apparent, Lincoln voiced the traditional American trust in God when he said to the neighbors who had come to say farewell:

My friends, no one not in my position can appreciate the sadness I feel at this parting. A duty devolves upon me which is perhaps greater than that which has devolved upon any other man since the days of Washington. He never would have succeeded except for the aid of Divine Providence upon which at all times he relied. I feel that I can not succeed without the same divine aid which sustained him. I hope you, my friends, will all pray that I may receive the same divine assistance with which success is certain.

Both sides in the appalling conflict which ensued, leaders and followers alike, Lincoln, Davis, Grant, Lee, McClellan, Jackson, and other mighty figures, exhibited a heroism in march and charge, in camp and Cabinet, a devotion to truth as each conceived it, that could proceed only from the most unlimited faith in the Infinite Preserver. [Applause.]

Both sides achieved eternal victories, the one having preserved a nation, the other having defied annihilation and challenged death for its conception of the right. [Applause.] When the assassination of Lincoln in April, 1865, had filled the world with gloom and dread and disturbances more violent than those of war seemed imminent, we hear the voice of Garfield as he lifted the American flag above the rioters in New York, "God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives." Immediately the country caught the spirit of this matchless appeal and another crisis had been mastered. It was about this time, at the culmination of the period which established the unity and permanency of the Republic that Congress, as if by inspiration, ordered the sentence "In God we trust," a sentence summarizing the history and reflecting the character of the American people, to be inscribed upon the nation's coinage. For more than forty years it has there remained to remind us of our origin and the world of our faith. Who can doubt that its educational and ethical value has been immense? Who will not regret its displacement on certain coins to make way for the Gaudens design, a design which shows on one side a woman in savage head-dress, on the other a Roman eagle in predatory flight—the one side a degradation of woman, the other a eulogy of war? [Applause.]

It is particularly appropriate that the inscription "In God we trust" should appear upon our national moneys. The coinage of a country is the most concrete and universal evidence of its sovereignty. Is it not fitting that this most elemental expression of government should contain a recognition of the power to which the Government owes its foundation, its growth, its glory? Again, the coinage is, as a rule, the first and most general token of government with which American children and foreigners seeking our citizenship become familiar. It enters fundamentally into the people's lives and thoughts and hopes. It is the vitalizing element in commerce, society, and government. Bearing the words "In God we trust," it would suggest to every child and every citizen the genius of American institutions; it would lead every foreigner to study American ideals in the light of a proper philosophy. [Applause.] It is a poor time to remove this motto when economic disaster shrouds the land, when the successful and the rich of yesterday are the suicides and paupers of to-day. For the reasons enumerated, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the beautiful and stately sentence "In God we trust," so symbolic of American history, American aspiration, American faith, should be permanently inscribed upon the coinage of the United States. [Applause.] And permit me, sir, to express the firm belief that the eye of God is watching the American fleet as it speeds to-day through distant seas beneath strange suns and stranger stars, and that if we are destined, contrary to our desires and prayers, to meet in combat the foremost heathen power of the globe, the God of Washington, of Lincoln, and of Lee will again crown the American arms with victory. [Great applause.]

APPENDIX A.

[Extract from Christian Herald, Dec. 25, 1907.]

LET CONGRESS RESTORE IT.

In presenting in this issue the opinions of a large number of our readers regarding the removal of the time-honored motto, "In God we trust," from the national coinage, the Christian Herald makes no apology for devoting considerable space to the topic which is still uppermost in the minds and hearts of many Americans. These letters represent only a portion of the very large number actually received; but they are sufficient to show beyond all cavil the trend of public opinion, which is distinctly averse to the removal of the motto.

It is not necessary here to review the many reasons set forth by the writers of these letters in favor of restoration. Their conclusions are fairly representative of American public opinion as a whole, and these conclusions must be apparent to every fair-minded person.

"A shock to the nation," "a blow at Christian sentiment," "the removal of an honored landmark," "a degenerate step backward," "a national blunder," "a slap in the face of our heavenly Father"—such are some of the expressions which show how deeply our people have been stirred by the effacement of the motto. They feel that a great wrong has been committed in sacrilegiously removing the words which imply national recognition of God's protecting care over our land and people and that dishonor has been done to the memories of those noble men who, in a time of severe national stress and trial, placed the motto on our coinage.

We note that a measure has already been introduced in Congress for the restoration of the motto. Every loyal American citizen will desire its passage. Let us see to it that we do not falsify history by impudently effacing from our coinage the recognition due to Him to whom we owe all our national greatness, happiness, and prosperity.

[Extract from Christian Herald, December, 25, 1907.]

A GREAT NATIONAL PROTEST.

Nothing that has happened in years has touched the American heart more deeply and painfully than the removal of the time-honored motto from the national coinage. Many hundreds of letters on the subject have been received by the Christian Herald, and they are still coming, in apparently undiminished volume. The overwhelming majority demand the restoration of the motto. These letters, which come from every State and are a sure index of the general feeling throughout the nation, if published in full, would fill almost an entire issue of the Christian Herald. We give a number of them in these two pages:

SHOW THE WORLD WHERE WE STAND.

Every effort should be made to have the motto restored to our coins. It has always impressed me as being a beautiful and yet positive way of showing the world just where and how we stand in our relation to Him "whose we are and whom we serve."

MRS. JAMES MITCHELL.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

RESTORE THE MOTTO.

We trust that this motto may be restored on the coin and there remain.

MRS. WM. CARROLL.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

THIS IS "GOD'S COUNTRY."

As this is God's beloved country, the words should certainly be retained along with the American eagle.

ELBRIDGE G. STOUT.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

THE NATION SHOULD TRUST IN GOD.

I am sorry that the motto "In God we trust," has been left off of our coins. It inspired us to know that we, as a nation, trusted in God, and were not ashamed to admit it. May we continue to trust in God as a little child would trust its mother. "Trust ye in the Lord forever, for in the Lord Jehovah there is everlasting strength." Isaiah, 26:4.

MRS. MINNA O. BRAND.

EUREKA SPRINGS, ARK.

REMOVING THE SOLID FOUNDATION.

It caused us sorrow when we observed on the new coins the absence of the revered and time-honored motto. To eliminate this would seem like removing the solid foundation upon which America stands and has stood for years. It would seem like ignoring the sacrifices made by the Pilgrim Fathers, the victories of the American Revolution and the triumph of faith in God manifested by Lincoln when, after prayer, with the stroke of his pen, 3,000,000 slaves were set free.

MRS. L. H. KENNEY.

AMELIA STEWART.

T. R. S. CRAIG.

M. E. MCKAIG, Philadelphia.

EARL B. CRAIG, M. D.

WILMINGTON.

GOD THE NATION'S STRENGTH.

The motto, "In God we trust," should never be dropped from our coins. Who but God has been our strength and stay and made us the nation we are to-day? Praise and honor to His holy name.

S. A. D. H.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

LIKE THE ATHEISM OF FRANCE IN 1790.

The dropping from our coins of the motto "In God we trust" appeals to every Christian who has a spark of patriotism left in his heart. No Christian whose forefathers had a hand in helping to found this God-given country, and who, in fleeing from home and native land to avoid persecution, left all that they held dear to find a home where they could worship God in peace and security, can possibly object to the stamping of that dear name and motto for which their fathers suffered so much. I never dreamed that President Roosevelt would sanction such a want of reverence. It seems too much like the first step toward ruin, and not far removed from the act of France in the revolution of 1790, when they decreed that God did not exist.

N. W. MERRILL.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

"GOD FORBID."

God forbid that they change the motto on our coin.
 N. W. WINSTON.
 LOUISA, VA.

WHICH SIDE WANTS THE MOTTO?

There are only two great leaders in this world, Christ and the devil. They are the very opposite in almost everything. Which of these desires the motto on our coins to remain, and which one wants it erased? I think the party of Christ wants it to remain, while the other party would like to see it forever erased from every coin and the image and knowledge of Jesus erased from every heart.

STATESVILLE, N. C.

REV. W. T. LONE.

ARE WE FORGETTING GOD?

I am decidedly in favor of replacing the motto "In God we trust" on our national coin. It seems to me that there is a general tendency to go away from God in nearly everything now.

EDMUNDS, N. DAK.

MRS. M. E. CRAVATH.

CLING TO THE MOTTO.

If we, as a Christian nation, allow the removal of our motto, "In God we trust," from our coins on account of ridicule and irreverence, we disown God and give permission also to remove the date for the same cause. Can our nation afford to do this?

Cling to our motto, "In God we trust,"
 This for our nation surely is just.
 God is our leader, He is our Guide,
 Do not insult and set Him aside.

PITTSFORD, MICH.

B. L. TURNER.

PUT BACK THE MOTTO.

Shall we not have the motto still,
 These words, "In God we trust,"
 Upon our gold and silver coins?
 Yes, keep it there we must.
 Our God has fought our battles well,
 Kept us through good and ill;
 Has given us peace and plenty, too;
 Can we not trust Him still?
 Are we a Christian nation yet,
 And fear the truth to own?
 "In God we trust," oh, let that fact
 In every land be known.
 Put back the motto on our coin,
 And let us keep it there;
 And as a nation, by our deeds,
 Its truthfulness declare.

WALTON, N. H.

A. R. P.

WE NEED GOD'S HELP ALWAYS.

I am distressed that our good President should remove our ancient landmark. We are a Christian nation, but there is much to alarm us. Violence and suicides reign. In a single issue of the Ledger six suicides were reported. There is so much lawlessness and ungodliness that we need all the help and the recognition of our God to sustain us in our perils.

GERMANTOWN, PA.

MRS. E. B. STARK.

A DANGEROUS STEP.

We should keep the sacred motto, "In God we trust," on all our national coinage, because it is a sermon in itself and shows to the world that we as a nation believe in one God and recognize Him in our very commercial life. I hope and trust the inscription will be replaced. Many things that are dangerous we are doing as a people, among them ruling the Holy Bible out of our public schools in so many cities.

ASHEVILLE, N. C.

J. M. STONER.

DEPRECATED BY ALL GOOD MEN.

I join with all good men in deprecating this sad departure from the God-honoring ways of the wise men of other days. The word still remains true, "Them that honor Me I will honor, and they that despise Me shall be lightly esteemed." I Sam., 2:30.

NEW YORK.

JOSEPH B. MAXFIELD.

RESTORE THE WORDS.

"In God we trust." Most woeful day
 When ceases thus our land to pray.
 Restore the words you took away
 From off our coins—brook no delay.
 No matter what the scoffers say,
 "In God we trust"—no better way.
 Then lift us high, don't drag us down,
 And with the stars let's wear the crown.
 "In God we trust"—let's pass it on.
 Each time we trade with God's own coin.
 Let's raise the standard to the throne,
 On coin, in life, the Lord to own.

ROANOKE, VA.

THEODORE LOW.

A SAD MISTAKE.

I think it is a sad mistake to remove the motto. With the widespread desecration of the Sabbath, the motto gone from our coins, the name of Jesus taken from the song books at Christmas, where are we drifting? When I heard that the words "In God we trust," were left off the new coins, it seemed as though a star had fallen from the flag.

Shall we now cease to trust Him? Are we ashamed? It is written: "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

MILLINGTON, MD.

MARY E. BRYAN.

WILL THE BIBLE BE DROPPED NEXT?

We are much opposed to the dropping of the motto "In God we trust." Man must and ever will repose his trust in something; it may be wealth, influence, an idol, himself. No one of these can be trusted. "Trust ye in the Lord forever, for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength." The dropping of the motto must have its root very near the borders of atheism; the next step may be the dropping of the Bible, as in the time of the French revolution.

E. M. SAPP.

SHINNSTON, W. VA.

DO WE TRUST IN GOD ANY MORE?

Some one said to me the other day, "I guess they are going to leave it off because we don't trust in God any more." If that is not "making light of the matter" and leaving us in bad shape for the future, if many people reason that way, I am much mistaken. I am one of those who still "Trust in God," whether the motto be on or off of our coins. I believe, too, for the welfare of coming generations, we can not keep the solemn words too conspicuously in the sight of our people.

C. S.

CANTON, OHIO.

A "GREAT BLUNDER."

The inscription was a natural outcome of our faith, and its removal is a probably undesigned slap in the face to the predicted programme of the gospel. If the allegation of "bad taste" be right, the prophet was surely wrong when he declared that the sacred inscription on the high priest's miter, "Holiness unto the Lord," should eventually find place on the "bells of the horses." God commanded the ancients to write the sacred verities of their faith upon the posts of their houses, and afterwards, by the mouth of Isaiah, denounced those who showed their divided allegiance in setting up their memorial "behind the doors," where they could not be seen. A nation's faith needs no protection from the jests of a few fools. Only a great man could be capable of so great a blunder.

(REV.) WM. POWICK.

ALLENTOWN, PA.

LET THE MOTTO STAND.

The motto is an expression of honor, gratitude, and love from the American nation to the God who made them free. The God of love wants public expression from His people, that the world may see and profit by it, and He honors any opportunity taken to acknowledge Him. Can this nation afford to cast aside so far-reaching an opportunity as is given by the motto on the coins, to honor the God who has so abundantly blessed them? Let the beautiful words stand forth on gold and silver, and keep ever before our eyes the thought of Him who gave us liberty.

ADA F. BUTTON.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

CONGRESS SHOULD RESTORE IT.

Congress should restore the motto on our national coins as the motto of all our basic laws. Historians of future centuries would then know beyond doubt that these coins represented a Christian nation which trusted in God, notwithstanding the skeptic's opinion.

F. S. CASHION.

HENNESSEY, OKLA.

A MENACE TO OUR INSTITUTIONS.

The proposition to remove the motto is not American, and it should be retained as a landmark of our beloved country. The war upon the Bible, the recent action of the school board in New York to exclude the name of Christ from the books of song, and the removal of our national motto from our coins, all should be regarded as a menace to our Government and its institutions.

REV. D. BANCROFT.

SPERRY, IOWA.

HOW AN IMMIGRANT VIEWS IT.

When I first came to this country and noticed the motto on the first dollar I received my heart was moved and I felt more warmly toward the American Government. The motto is a Christian herald to all nations.

Let all the people together join
 And keep the motto on the coin.

JOHN OWEN.

BLACKINTON, MASS.

IT EXPRESSES THE NATION'S FAITH.

It is the nonsectarian motto not of the few, but of the many, and being such should not have been removed from the coinage without popular approval. A motto expressive of patriotism has no more right upon our coins than one expressive of the faith without which a nation would presently find itself in the dust. Old Glory is not too good for everyday use; neither is the grand old motto which has so long publicly expressed the highest faith of the great American people.

CHARLES E. THOMPSON.

RUTLAND, VT.

LET CONGRESS RESTORE IT.

Replace the motto on all gold and silver coins by the highest authority of this nation—an act of Congress. I manifested my love of country by leaving my wife and three sons and serving three years in the Eleventh Kansas Volunteers. Am now nearing the four-score mark, but hope and pray, ere God calls me home, to see this motto replaced on our coins, thus acknowledging God who has kept us and manifesting to the world that we are a Christian people.

G. W. WALKER.

SALINA, KANS.

THEY STAND FOR OUR HIGHEST IDEAL.

These words on the nation's coins have all these years stood for an ideal, and if retained will continue as a silent monitor to point the way. If removed, what a lever it will put into the hands of the atheist!

PAUL GRABILL.

DES MOINES, IOWA.

RESPECT THE DIVINE PROMISE.

God says, "He that honoreth Me, I will honor," and that stands for nation as well as individual.

FRED LEACH.

CAPAC, MICH.

SHOULD BE INSTANTLY REPLACED.

As an American citizen I believe the motto "In God we trust" should be instantly restored to its time-honored place on our national coins. While absolutely nonsectarian, it expresses the deep, unwavering faith of the vast mass of our people. Its removal shocks the moral sense of the nation, and nothing less than its prompt and full restoration will satisfy the conscience of this Christian land.

CHAUNCEY N. POND,
Editor Plantation Missionary.

OBERLIN, OHIO.

DISHONORING GOD.

Nations are honored or dishonored as they honor or dishonor God. "Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord." I feel that a great many of our blessings as a nation are due to this public testimony of trust in God.

MRS. HARRY WATKIN.

EAST LIVERPOOL, OHIO.

DON'T HAUL DOWN THE BANNER.

The removal of the motto shows an evidence of weakness and a catering to the adversary on the part of the authorities in power. So long as we claim to be a Christian nation, Christian mottoes should dominate its citizens. When a professedly Christian nation obliterates its Christian motto it permits or licenses the banner of truth to be hauled down and trampled under the feet of men.

E. FRANCIS.

AUSTIN, ILL.

IS IT BLASPHEMY?

The Government of the United States has for many years proclaimed to the world that "In God we trust," but now she backs down; takes it all back. We trust in God no longer. If that is not blasphemy, what is it?

E. R. REED.

MADISON, WIS.

KEEP THE BANNER FLYING.

It is true this sublime sentiment has often been made the subject of blasphemous insult, but so has our flag. We do not ignore Christ because He has been scourged and spit upon. We do not haul down the Stars and Stripes because they have at times been trampled under brutal feet. Let us nail our colors to the masthead and go on to either defeat or victory, with our banners flying and with our trust in the living God emblazoned upon our coinage!

ELIZABETH A. REED.

CHICAGO, ILL.

AN EVENT OF ILL OMEN.

Are we grown so arrogant and independent that we need no longer proclaim to all nations our trust in God? I predict our troubles have not begun if we do not have the motto replaced.

MRS. E. M. GAUSE.

CROCKETT, TEX.

A NATION'S INDIGNATION AROUSED.

The plan to eliminate "In God we trust" from our national coinage has aroused the indignation it justly deserves.

HOUSTON BRELAND.

HATTIESBURG, MISS.

A BACKWARD STEP.

The elimination of the motto is a backward step. This step is on a par with the un-American, illogical policy of banishing the Bible and its teachings from the public schools of New York and Ohio.

F. J. OBLINGER.

TOLEDO, OHIO.

A PRESBYTERIAN PASTOR'S PROTEST.

I consider this a time to register my protest as it pertains to the unexpected action taken by our President. It only proves the saying correct which declares "All great men are not always wise." We, as citizens of the Republic who love that sacred sentence, ought not to be robbed of our right use of it because of the other fellow's abuse of it. We would not like to see this landmark removed and none put in its place.

(REV.) H. W. EWART.

SUMNER, IOWA.

A STRONG PROTEST URGED.

From friends who have expressed their opinions concerning the removal of the motto, I have not heard a dissenting voice. I feel with them that it should be retained, especially on our silver coins, as they are most in circulation. Let us hope that a strong protest on the part of our people may assure the continued imprint of a sentiment which acknowledges faith in the Almighty.

JULIA BILLINGS.

NEW YORK CITY.

OUGHT TO BE RESTORED.

The reason given in The Christian Herald for the words "In God we trust" being placed upon the coinage ought to hold for all time. I sincerely hope that the words "In God we trust" may be restored to the coinage.

ELLEN J. SALISBURY.

BERLIN, WIS.

A BLOW AT CHRISTIAN SENTIMENT.

The motto has adorned our coin for many years; and if left off now, the effect will certainly not aid or increase Christian sentiment, but rather the reverse. We should trust God in all things. Why, then, is the motto out of place on our coins when we claim to be a Christian nation?

W. C. OLIVER.

OAK RIDGE, N. J.

A TRUE AMERICAN'S PROTEST.

I am now in the eighty-first year of my age. My forefathers (on my father's side) were among the Pilgrims of Plymouth, and my grandfather was a soldier of the Revolution. My ancestors, paternal and maternal, took part in the early affairs of this God-blessed country.

"In God we trust" is the basic expression of our faith and trust as a free and united people. David, "the sweet singer of Israel," called upon his people to trust in God and sing his praise for their deliverance from bondage. Our Key-written song, "The Star-Spangled Banner," gives the theme for our praise and the source of our deliverance. Our silver and gold, with the motto indelibly stamped thereon, circulate, and our flag floats, in and over "the isles of the sea." From these the Cubans and Filipinos may learn our mission and profit by our example. "The isles shall wait for his law." Isa., 42: 4.

Shall we not profit by the history of nations in the past and learn wisdom? Read I Sam., 8: 7.

When the order was given to strike "In God we trust" from our coin, it was the worst strike ever ordered in the history of our country. Congress should at once order a halt and a restoration of the motto.

JOHN W. PALMER.

PORT REPUBLIC, VA.

Letters favoring the restoration of the motto have also been received from Thomas Thorsen, Edmund, Wis.; W. B. Essick, Manley, Nebr.; Mrs. E. M. Colvin, Indianola, Iowa; Mrs. Carroll, Brooklyn, N. Y.; E. M. F., Bloomfield, N. J.; T. C. Overman, Marion, Ind.; A. E. Cunningham, Stamford, Conn.; G. D. Telfer, Elroy, Wis.; Abram Wilson, Westbranch, Iowa; Mrs. E. M. Kingston, N. Y.; Mrs. H. E. Parker, Warehouse Point, Conn.; A. Reader, Marvin, Kans.; Fannie L. Lake, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. H. Ruple, Buck Creek, Ind.; D. N. Tarrand, East Hardwick, Vt.; W. H. Seymour, Lake Crystal, Minn.; M. T. Middlebrook, Atlanta, Ga.; J. J. Dack, Stanton, Minn.; James T. Runders, Blue Rapids, Kans.; C. H. Field, Lancaster, Ohio; Wilma Rose, Hickory Valley, Tenn.; John H. Eyr, Morristown, Tenn.; Miss H. W. Renefeld, Kalamazoo, Mich.; Mrs. W. A. Wilson, Keyville, Va.; J. C. Barnes, Eddyville, Nebr.; Dr. J. L. Davis, Seville, Tenn.; Mrs. L. G. Curtis, Alexandria, Mo.; Mrs. Emma Radolph, Sterling, Ill.; Benjamin Ewans, Cambria, Wis.; Mrs. M. E. Shear, Clearmont, Mo.; E. K., Walden, N. Y.; Ruth Greenman, Frankfort, Ky.; W. R. Metcalf, Bosworth, N. C.; Harry K. E. George, Rochester, N. Y.; John F. Idol, Burlington, N. C.; Mrs. John Hittie, Rossburg, Ohio; Mrs. L. J. Whitcomb, Albion, Mich.; O. W. Beckett, Stronghurst, Ill.; Mrs. W. P. Welsher, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Mr. and Mrs. George School, Potosi, Wis.; Mrs. Harriet Hurst, Potosi, Wis.; M. A. Cone and M. L. Cone, Bloomfield, Mo.; Margaret S. Baker, Xenia, Ohio; Winslow Buck, Moberly, Mo.; Ellen T. Carle, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; William Kramers, Girardville, Pa.; E. F. Gilletts, Dresden, Kans.; S. Yutema, Hudsonville, Mich.; Thomas Henshall, Kansas City, Mo.; Mrs. W. L. Cook, Worces, Mass.; William Haughton, Albany, N. Y.; James Meloney, Imperial, Pa.; Jennie Bullerfeld Smith, Cynthia, Ky.; Henry Schmetzer, Lancaster, Nebr.; Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Holcomb, Butternut, Mich.; S. S. Shipley, Luther, Okla.; W. W. Pollock, Kirksville, Mo., and many others.

APPENDIX B.

[Extract from Knoxville (Tenn.) Sentinel, December 19, 1907.]

COINAGE MOTTO IS AUTHORIZED.—CONGRESS ENACTED A LAW PROVIDING FOR "IN GOD WE TRUST."—SALMON CHASE ITS AUTHOR.—LINCOLN'S SECRETARY OF TREASURY ACTED UPON CLERGYMAN'S SUGGESTION.

The statement in President Roosevelt's letter to the effect that there had been no warrant in law for placing the motto "In God we trust" upon United States coins naturally suggests the question, How and by what authority did the motto get there? [says the New York Evening Post].

That question is fully answered by a report of the Director of the United States Mint, reprinted in 1897 in the Bankers' Magazine, of this city.

A first suggestion of such recognition of the Deity came, in 1861, from a Pennsylvania clergyman, who feared that antiquarians of the future might deduce that the United States had been a pagan country because of the absence of any evidence to the contrary on its coins.

But the form of the recognition as it was finally adopted and stamped upon the gold and silver coins was determined by Salmon P. Chase, Secretary of the Treasury in President Lincoln's Cabinet. There was no specific act of Congress directing that the words "In God we trust" be put upon the coins, but, although President Roosevelt found no "warrant in law" for the words, it is a matter of record that the Secretary of the Treasury ordered the Director of the Mint to stamp them on the money, and in 1864 Congress authorized such devices on the coins as should be fixed by the Director, with the approval of the Secretary.

SUGGESTED BY A CLERGYMAN.

Further legislative authority for the motto was given by the coinage bills passed by Congress in 1865 and 1873.

The report of the Director of the Mint is as follows:

"From the records of the Department it appears that the first suggestion of the recognition of the Deity on the coins of the United States was contained in a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Hon. S. P. Chase, by the Rev. M. R. Watkinson, minister of the gospel, Ridleyville, Pa., under date of November 13, 1861, which was as follows:

"RIDLEYVILLE, PA., November 13, 1861.

"DEAR SIR: You are about to submit your annual report to Congress respecting the affairs of the national finances.

"One fact touching our currency has hitherto been seriously overlooked. I mean the recognition of the Almighty God in some form on our coins.

"You are probably a Christian. What if our Republic were now shattered beyond reconstruction? Would not the antiquarians of succeeding centuries rightly reason from our past that we were a heathen nation? What I propose is that, instead of the Goddess of Liberty, we shall have next inside the thirteen stars a ring inscribed with the words 'perpetual union'; within this ring the all-seeing eye, crowned with a halo; beneath this eye the American flag, bearing in its field stars equal to the number of States united; in the folds of the bars the words 'God, liberty, law.'

"This would make a beautiful coin, to which no possible citizen could object. This would relieve us from the ignominy of heathenism. This would place us openly under the divine protection we have per-

sonally claimed. From my heart I have felt our national shame in disowning God as not the least of our present national disasters.

"To you, first, I address a subject that must be agitated."
"M. R. WATKINSON,
"Minister of the Gospel."

"Hon. S. P. CHASE, Secretary of the Treasury."

AUTHORIZED BY S. P. CHASE.

"Under the date of November 20, 1861, the Secretary of the Treasury addressed the following letter to the Director of the Mint:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, November 20, 1861.

"DEAR SIR: No nation can be strong except in the strength of God or safe except in His defense. The trust of our people in God should be declared on our national coin.

"You will cause a device to be prepared without unnecessary delay with a motto expressing in the fewest and tersest words possible this national recognition.

"Yours, truly,

S. P. CHASE.

"JAMES POLLOCK, Esq.,

"Director of the Mint, Philadelphia, Pa."

"It was found that the act of January 18, 1837, prescribed the mottoes and devices that should be placed upon the coins of the United States, so that nothing could be done without legislation.

"In December, 1863, the Director of the Mint submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury for approval designs for 1, 2, and 3 cent pieces, on which it was proposed that one of the following mottoes should appear: 'Our country'; 'Our God'; 'God, our trust.'

LEGISLATION BY CONGRESS.

"The Secretary of the Treasury, in a letter addressed to the Director of the Mint, under the date of December 9, 1863, uses the following language:

"I approve your mottoes, only suggesting that on that with the Washington obverse the motto should begin with the word 'Our,' so as to read: 'Our God and our country,' and on that with the shield it should be changed so as to read: 'In God we trust.'

"An act was passed April 22, 1864, changing the composition of the 1-cent piece and authorizing the coinage of the 2-cent piece, the devices of which were to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; and it is upon the 2-cent bronze piece that the motto 'In God we trust' first appears.

"The act of March 3, 1865, provided that in addition to the legend and device on the gold and silver coins of the United States it should be lawful for the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to place the motto 'In God we trust' on such coins as shall admit of the inscription thereon. Under this act the motto was placed upon the double eagle, eagle, and half eagle, and also upon the dollar, half, and quarter dollars in the latter part of 1865.

"The coinage act of February 12, 1873, provided that the Secretary of the Treasury may cause the motto 'In God we trust' to be inscribed on such coins as shall admit of such motto.

"This is a brief history of the motto 'In God we trust,' as shown by the records of the Department."

CINCINNATI, OHIO, November 14.

Deploing the failure to put the motto "In God we trust" on United States coins, the Presbyterian Brotherhood of America, at its final session to-day, adopted a resolution urging Congress to restore the inscription on all coins.

Mr. PAYNE. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL].

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened, as I am sure all the members of the committee have listened, not only with great pleasure but with profit, to the eloquent remarks of the scholarly gentleman from Texas, and I think we will all concede that in every fit and appropriate way the American people should show to the world that we are a God-fearing people. No nation has ever had greater cause to thank Providence for the career which it has had in its national life. But it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, there is an appropriate time and an appropriate manner to show that trust in an overruling Providence.

I presume that the appropriateness of time and place and manner of rendering unto God the things that are God's was never better shown than in that remarkable parable in which a coin was used as an illustration with such convincing effect. The way in which to show, Mr. Chairman, our trust in God is in our lives as individuals and in our influence as a nation. There are, however, occasions where the expression of our faith would be untimely and therefore irreverent. If the removal of this legend indicates that we have lost our faith as a people or that the President in approving its removal was lacking in proper reverence and regard for national ideals, then the criticisms of the gentleman from Texas would perhaps be justifiable. But do we strengthen our faith or reverently exhibit it by blazoning it upon our coinage?

Following along the line of argument of the gentleman from Texas, it would be as appropriate to place this motto upon all the commissions and other documents that are issued by the United States. Let me close by reading the words of that parable which, as I have said, show the proper time and place and manner of displaying our faith in Omnipotence and the propriety of discriminating between things worldly and things divine. I read from the twenty-second chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, beginning at the fifteenth verse:

15. Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle Him in His talk.

16. And they sent out unto Him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, Master, we know that Thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest Thou for any man: for Thou regardest not the person of men.

17. Tell us, therefore, What thinkest Thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?

18. But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye Me, ye hypocrites?

19. Shew Me the tribute money. And they brought unto Him a penny.

20. And He saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription?

21. They say unto Him, Caesar's. Then saith He unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's.

22. When they had heard these words they marveled and left Him, and went their way.

This doctrine was sufficient warrant for the course pursued by the President, who has displayed good judgment, discriminating taste, and a proper reverence.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat in closing that the place to show the faith to which the gentleman from Texas has so beautifully alluded is in the lives of our citizens and in the influence of our Government, and let us make our coinage the sound coinage of a faith-keeping Commonwealth. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, how much time is there remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has thirty-four minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to make a prepared speech, in the hope that I may either entertain or instruct you, but there are certain observations that I now desire to make as to the state of the country and as to the President's message, which is so broad that it covers almost every subject of national interest, and as to the state of the country, and certain particular criticisms as to certain parts of that message.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I believe that it will now be generally conceded throughout the country that we, at least, have a panic—a real, widespread Republican panic. It is an inexcusable panic because cotton, corn, and wheat have all brought good prices, and the agricultural and manufacturing interests of the country have prospered as never before at the very time when this panic came. It is a panic caused by tremendous stock-gambling operations all over the country, and especially in that great center of such operations, New York City. The fact that this panic stretches out from New York to every part of the country, and from the stock gamblers themselves to every class of industrious and honest citizens, is a fact for which the Republican party is entirely responsible and from which responsibility it may not hope to escape. New York would never have been the industrial and financial despot of the Republic but for the reserve-city provisions in our national banking laws, making New York the chief reserve city of the entire country and allowing other national banks in the minor reserve cities, in which list of cities are included the principal financial and industrial cities of the Republic, to keep on deposit in New York one-half of their cash reserve fund, and allowing about 4½ per cent of the cash reserve fund of all the other national banks in the country to be kept there. The national bankers can, by keeping in New York as much of their reserve fund as the law allows, obtain either credit or interest from the New York banks, and sometimes both. This system makes New York the great money center of the Republic, its financial despot, and when New York sneezes we all must take snuff. The result is that the suspension of currency payments in New York has occasioned a like suspension of currency payment by the banks throughout the country, and the stock gamblers and frenzied financiers in New York have brought financial disaster to every part of our country by being unable or unwilling to turn loose the money that is so essential to the business of the country and which has been banked up there under the provisions of the law to which I have referred. This law was enacted and is kept in force by the Republican party, and the responsibility for it is clearly upon that party.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask this question of my Republican friends: When you go to the country in the election about to come, will you say that it is a Roosevelt panic? Will you say that it is a Roosevelt panic because Mr. Roosevelt has been "Democratic in spots," to use the words of a much more distinguished Democrat than myself, or do you propose to stand by him and say, as you have been shouting and vociferating for the past four years, that the Republican party, as well as Mr. Roosevelt, is responsible for what has been done? Republican financiers in New York City and throughout the country and Republican newspapers in New York and in other States are now assuming the "safe, sane, and conservative" pose; they are now saying that Mr. Roosevelt's trust baiting, more deadly than either his "bear baiting" or his "wolf hunting," has caused the panic; they are saying that persecution of the railroads and the demagogic arraying of the people against property interests are responsible for impaired confidence and

the resulting financial troubles. Only the other day the distinguished gentleman who so eloquently nominated the President at your last national convention referred to him as the "man on the barrel," exhorting the crowd to madness and almost to mob law, and the great Republican newspapers in New York printed in parallel columns the eloquent words of ex-Governor Black at the Republican convention in 1904 and the scorching words of the same distinguished gentleman before the New Hampshire Bar Association in 1907.

Now, so far as I may venture to speak for the Democratic party, I wish to say that we do not believe that Mr. Roosevelt is responsible for this panic; we do not believe that even his so-called "trust baiting" has caused it; we do not believe that his prosecution of the trusts has been wrong; we do not believe that the requirement that the railroads shall charge the public only just and reasonable rates is a mistake. If these policies have exposed overcapitalization, if they have wrung the water out of certain stocks and securities that have been foisted on an unsuspecting public, if they have bared robbery, if they have put an end to, or even lessened, discriminatory dealings and unjust charges, then we ought to be glad to submit to any little temporary flurry which has resulted from "the turning on of the light." To use substantially the President's own figure of speech, I submit that if there is a cancer in the body politic, then the knife of the surgeon must be fearlessly applied in order to save the life of the patient, even if the operation is painful. It is far better to submit to the pain of the operation in order that a sound condition may be restored than to await certain death that would come from the disease if the operation were not performed. [Loud applause.]

So-called prosperity is not so dear that we are willing to purchase it at the price of supine and unmanly submission to extortion and injustice. [Applause.] If railroad securities are so delicate and sensitive that they can be blighted and withered because the railroads are required to do simple justice to the public, then the sooner these securities are pruned to a proper size and shape the better for the public. The Democratic party does not advocate and has never advocated injustice to railroads or to any other corporation, but it has never submitted to and will never submit to injustices from the railroads or other corporations to the public even if the failure to do so will cause not one but many panics. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, it is my desire to show you and the country how proud some of the most prominent Republicans in Congress have been, for a long time past, of these very policies that the President has advocated, and which these "safe, sound, and conservative" newspapers in the North and in the West, in the East and in the South are saying has wrecked business, ruined industrial conditions, and brought on a distressing panic. On June 26, 1906, my eloquent and able friend from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] made a speech on the floor of this House that was so forceful and so eloquent that the Republican Congressional campaign committee thought it worthy of preservation and embalmed it in your last Republican text-book for the Congressional campaign of 1906; and, by the way, there are some very interesting things in that book. I see from the back of it that you can buy it somewhere in New York City, either on Broadway or on Wall street (Broadway, I believe, but pretty near Wall street). You can buy it for one dollar, and I tell you it is worth the money—not as a source of information, for I think it is largely a mass of misinformation, but is a compilation of Republican admission and confessions, and of a whole lot of things that are going to rise up and hit the Republican party in the face whenever it becomes once more thoroughly "safe, sane, and conservative" and nominates some conservative reactionary for President. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, to return to Mr. TOWNSEND's speech. He said:

The Sherman antitrust law, a Republican measure, has been enforced by a Republican Executive until illegal combinations are in great fear and trembling, while some of their constituents are either on the road to the penitentiary or hiding from the officers of justice. Under the leadership of an incorruptible, fearless, and patriotic President, supported by an equally patriotic Congress, a campaign has been made against fraud and corruption in what hitherto has been called "high places," which has given hope and courage to honest men, and placed the crown of honor where it belongs, upon the brow of true American manhood.

But the distinguished gentleman from Michigan is not the only authority that I wish to cite in this connection. Let me call your attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WARSON] made on this floor, on the very day following the speech of the gentleman from Michigan, on June 27, 1906. This speech was also considered worthy of the embalming process, and is likewise to be found in the last Republican text-book.

The gentleman from Indiana, with that exuberance and eloquence for which he is so justly famous, gave a long list of the naughty trusts that have been brought to the bar of justice by this great Republican President. He spoke of the paper trust, of the tobacco trust, the drug trust and the elevator trust (I did not know that there was one of that character until I heard his speech), of the coal trust, and of a host of other wicked trusts, a brief summary of which required nine pages of eloquence, so numerous and so naughty were they. Why, he then mentioned the Nome retail-grocery trust in far-away Alaska. On that subject he said:

The Government's prosecution of the trusts has extended even to far-away Alaska. Complaint was made that there was a combination known as the "Nome Retail Grocers' Association," which had fixed prices and suppressed competition. The Government took action, won a decree in its favor against the combination, and the Attorney-General is advised that the effect has been very salutary.

But Mr. Chairman, let me say, without any invidious comparison, that I am about now to quote from a gentleman who is still more distinguished as an exponent of Republican policies. I refer to no less a person than the distinguished Speaker of this House, who, returning to the bosom of the people who sent him here, made on August 16, 1906, an able and eloquent speech to his own constituents, explaining what Congress had done and what the state of the country was. On the subject "trust baiting," the Speaker said:

He [referring to the President] has been particularly zealous in administering the law against the trusts and combinations of capital which have ignored the old adage of "live and let live." The beef trust, the paper trust, the tobacco trust, the drug trust, the coal combinations, and various combinations of railroads and shippers have felt the heavy hand of the law, and learned that it is strong enough to compel them to give all a square deal. The record of trust prosecutions and investigations into their practices is too long to here recite, but it is acknowledged to be the most creditable even by our political opponents.

Not only that, gentlemen, but you have been boasting for several years past of the railroad rate legislation. You have said that the Republican party is responsible for it, assumed the credit and claimed the glory of it. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] boasts of it; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is also proud of it, and the Speaker of this House [Mr. CANNON] commends it. Each of them so expressed himself in the speeches to which I have already referred. Not only that, but your great leaders have spoken of President Roosevelt in terms of such unstinted admiration, of such broad and comprehensive commendation, and of such fulsome adulation, that the adjectives of a vocabulary no richer than mine would stand aghast at the task of repeating what you have said on this subject. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], in the speech to which I have referred, said:

Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, needs no encomium from me. He has already written his name high upon that illustrious roll of fame, along with those of Washington and Lincoln. Washington established the Republic; Lincoln preserved it; Roosevelt has dedicated it anew to the cause of justice and equality. The first two escaped not the calumniator and detractor. No man who has been strong and courageous for the right ever did, but the people, they who make republics, have crowned him benefactor. Some there have been who have sought to belittle our great President and have been audacious enough to attack him, but they only bear scars, and 80,000,000 American people have awarded him the victory. He at times may have been impulsive, but the impulse was born of love for the people; he has been strenuous, but the exigencies of the times have demanded it, and it has been the strenuousness of public service. He has done things, and who is there so reckless as to rise here or elsewhere and condemn what he has accomplished? By his fruits ye shall know him.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] paid the President the exceedingly valuable compliment in his speech of making no reference whatever to the Paul Morton incident.

Hear, also, the distinguished and lovable Speaker of the House break into eloquent eulogy of the President in his address to his constituents. He says:

In the Executive Departments of the Government the record of the party has been brilliant, courageous, and honest, and the name of "Roosevelt" has become a synonym for all those qualities throughout the realms of civilization. He has been the President of all the people, and he has been tireless in his efforts to serve the people by wise, just, and fearless administration of the law.

It seems to me that the Republican party, and particularly most of its members in Congress, is thoroughly committed to Roosevelt and Rooseveltism; I believe that it would be a difficult task for them to go to the country with the contention that we have had a Roosevelt panic, and yet how are they to admit that this is a Republican panic, since the most effective campaign argument that they have ever made is the false charge that the Democratic party was responsible for the last great panic that we had and the contention that no party under whose administration a panic occurred ought to be trusted by the people with power? What becomes of them in the next election if the people should determine to apply the old-time yardstick to them? The only safety for the leading lights of

the Republican party, in Congress at least, unless they are prepared to do a lot of humble-pie eating, is to nominate the Secretary of War, who at least has the manhood not to eat his own words and chew up his own record because hard times have come.

A large and ever-growing number of people in this country believe that there ought to be a revision of the tariff. Many of the Republicans even believe so. Now, when shall we have tariff revision? Now, I am going to cite you two authorities on that subject and neither of them is Democratic authority. One of them is that gentleman whose name is on every lip and was once first in every Republican heart. I do not know whether this is still true since the panic came. I refer to the President of the United States. Mr. Roosevelt says that we ought to have tariff revision after the Presidential election. If tariff revision is a good thing, if certain of the schedules need altering, why wait until after the election? If the people are suffering from wrongs and injustices, why postpone relief? Surely it is no sufficient answer to say, that to give relief from wrongs and injustices may bring on "business disturbances." The President himself contends that this is no good answer as far as the trusts and the railroads are concerned.

Let me inquire, in all sincerity and candor, why the same doctrine does not hold good when it comes to giving relief from an unjust tariff?

But I promised to quote from another distinguished Republican authority on the subject as to when we ought to have tariff revision; that authority is a Republican statesman, hardly less distinguished than the President himself, who is no less a person than the Speaker of this House, who in the same speech to his constituents, to which I have already referred, said we ought to have tariff revision when we no longer had prosperity. On that subject, the Speaker said:

Tariff revision in time of prosperity always has halted and will always halt business activity, production, and commerce. The manufacturer will lessen his output, for he fears to pile up his product unless there is reasonable certainty of realizing its cost and a fair profit. The farmer halts in making improvements and consumes less, because there is a shortened demand for his products. The decrease in the wages of labor alone pending revision would amount to many hundred million dollars. Where there is confidence and prosperity without precedent, there would be doubt and destruction of confidence.

I heartily indorse the platform lately adopted by the Republicans of Indiana, which in substance says that the Republican party will revise the tariff when it will do more good than harm to the masses of the people.

The latter part of this utterance smacks of some Delphic oracle, when the Speaker says that the Republican party will revise the tariff "when it will do more good than harm to the majority of the people." It is my judgment that if the Speaker is left to decide when the time shall arrive, we might possibly hope to see it twenty-four hours in advance of judgment day. Still, after all, the proposition of the Speaker was that the tariff ought to be revised when hard times came, and I think it would be a good thing for the country if we could act in accordance with the Cannon doctrine instead of the Roosevelt doctrine, and revise the tariff now, when we no longer have the prosperity of which our friends have been so long boasting. [Applause.] Under the Cannon doctrine what better time for revision than the present could be selected?

Now, let me call your attention to one specific reason why the tariff ought to be revised at once. It is an undoubted and undeniable fact that many large American manufacturers are selling enormous quantities of their products very much cheaper abroad than they are at home. Two years ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] said on this floor that only 3 per cent of the steel output, for instance, was sold to the export trade at a lower price than it was sold at home. There was considerable debate on this floor as to whether American manufacturers were selling cheaper abroad than at home. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], as I remember it, took one horn of the dilemma and denied the allegation that there was a difference in the two prices; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] took the other horn of the dilemma. He confessed and avoided. He said that it was a good thing, because, otherwise, American labor would have been out of employment. He said there was very little of it anyhow, and that it was necessary in order to keep American labor from going home to a hungry and foodless family. In support of his contention he cited the testimony of Judge E. H. Gary, chairman of the board of directors of the United States Steel Corporation, delivered before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, on April 11, 1906. I invite the attention of the House and of the country to this colloquy between Judge Gary and Mr. SPIGHT of Mississippi, a member of that committee.

I would like to ask this question—

Said Representative SPIGHT—

Has your company ever delivered your product in foreign yards at a cheaper rate than you sell to the domestic customers at your mills? The United States Steel Corporation is not an operating company—

Replied Judge Gary—

But I suppose you refer to our subsidiary companies. I have already stated that we have sold some of our products for export at certain prices, but those prices were f. o. b. the mill, and we have never delivered our products abroad for less than the cost to the domestic consumer at our mill.

Now, in opposition to that statement of Judge Gary, I desire to invite the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to an article from the New York Commercial on January 2, 1908. This paper is considered to be one of the greatest commercial papers in the country, and its utterances are generally accepted as high authority on matters industrial, commercial, and financial. In the course of the article to which I refer, and which I shall read, a citation is made from the Industrial World, an iron and steel publication, of Pittsburg, Pa., which is not suspected of having any Democratic tendencies. The article reads as follows:

Independent makers of tin plate and sheets are complaining over a report that the United States Steel Corporation has sold to Welsh tin plate makers 100,000 tons of sheet bars at \$10 a ton cheaper than they are quoting to manufacturers in the United States. Incidentally, the manufacturers of tin plate and sheets are chafing because they are unable to get steel bars at a price in keeping with prevailing conditions.

Advocates of lower duties are using the recent sale as an argument against the high tariff which enables the United States Steel Corporation to hold up the American steel makers for \$29 a ton while the same product is laid down at Swansea for \$21.98. The cost of transportation to Wales is about \$4.10 per ton, so that the actual price received f. o. b. Pittsburg is \$17.80, against \$29 quoted to the consumers in the Pittsburg district.

The Industrial World, an iron and steel publication in this city, which was founded for the purpose of maintaining the high tariff, in an editorial condemning the transaction, says:

Viewed from any conceivable standpoint these transactions deserve the severest condemnation. What does most to discredit the protective tariff system, what does most to unsettle the confidence of American consumers in the maintenance of the prices on all steel products, what does most to expose the sham in the claims made as to costs of iron and steel production, what does most to show that international price and agreements are likely to become universal, is the dumping of steel in foreign markets at prices enormously lower than the domestic rates. Nothing can do more to discredit the protective tariff system than such operations. The tariff on such material is high, yet it is only \$6.70. Did the Steel Corporation tie the foreign powers up tight, and did not the latter know that if they resold, their shipments would be stopped very promptly? They could ship these bars to the United States at a profit after paying transportation charges. The cheap plea of keeping mills going and employing labor through these exports is an insult to the intelligence of the American public. How much more employment would be created if the domestic prices were reduced to half as much?

Surely the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not contend that either one of these newspapers have manufactured statements in order to help the Democrats or to hurt the Republicans. I do not believe that he will or can dispute the facts stated in that article.

When—no, I will not say thieves, but high protectionists fall out, then honest men may hope to get their dues. [Laughter and applause.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania said on the floor of this House two years ago that we had to sell to the export trade at a smaller price in order to keep American labor employed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman fourteen minutes, which is the rest of my hour.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania contended that these sales must be made at a lower price to foreign consumers than to domestic consumers in order that the American workman might not go to a desolate home and a foodless feast, and yet this paper, which was "founded for the purpose of maintaining a high tariff," says that this very argument is an insult to American intelligence. The paper referred to contends, just as the Democratic party contended two years ago, that if the American manufacturer would sell his product a little cheaper to the American consumer, the American consumer would be able to buy more of it and labor would be employed just the same. [Applause.]

The question as to when the tariff is to be revised is entirely within the control of the Republican party. Will that party follow the Roosevelt plan and revise it after the election, or will it accept the Cannon doctrine and revise it either when we have no more prosperity or "when it will do more good than harm to the great mass of the people?" The responsibility of this question rests entirely upon Republican shoulders. We Democrats, as yet, have no power to revise it. We say that it ought to be revised now. We say that revision has

been too long delayed. We have been insistent, persistent, and consistent in our demand that the people shall have relief from the burdensome duties and oppressive schedules of the Dingley tariff. So far the people have made the mistake of denying to themselves the relief that will come from revision, but surely they will realize what their true interests are before much longer, and surely when high priests in the temple of protection, like my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and this iron and steel publication which was founded "for the purpose of maintaining a high tariff," disagree—when high priests of that distinguished and exalted character differ, then the honest consumer is about to come into his own.

Who is to revise the tariff? We can not settle when it is to be revised, but I tell you, and I say it without any intention of giving personal offense to anyone, that I had as soon call on a convention of thieves to revise the laws against larceny as to call a convention or congress of people who believe in high protection for protection's sake alone to revise the tariff laws. If there is any revision of that character, it will be a revision upward and not a revision downward. If the masses of the people are to ever get any relief, the tariff must be revised in their interest and not in the interest of the protected manufacturing classes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There is one other thing in the President's message to which I wish to refer as briefly as may be in the somewhat limited time at my disposal. The one thing only, outside of some few personal views and social habits, that keeps the President from being a pretty good Democrat is that he is fundamentally and entirely a Hamiltonian. He seems to believe in the centralization of all power in the Federal Government and in the absorption of as much of the Federal power by the Executive as possible. He has never believed and will never believe in the protection and preservation of the rights of the States. The doctrine enunciated by Secretary Root that when the States no longer exercise the powers confided to them exclusively by the Constitution, then the nation must assume and exercise these powers in order to protect the people, and that it can be done by executive and judicial construction is most dangerous, destructive, and even revolutionary.

There is little doubt, however, that the President shares this belief with his Cabinet officer. In this very message of his he contends because wheat, corn, and grain are raised in many different States, and a uniform standard of grade is desirable, that therefore Congress ought to establish the national system of grading wheat, corn, and grain. The same contention might be made with equal plausibility about cotton. The President contends further that the products to which he refers, viz, wheat, corn, and grain, ought not to be admitted to interstate or foreign commerce unless they conform to the national standard. Gentlemen of the House, this doctrine is dangerous to the extreme. If the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce is to be made the pretext and excuse for seizing upon and regulating every domestic affair and every internal concern in every State in the Union, how long will the States continue to exist, and how long will the constitutional system of government founded by our fathers, and which Republicans as well as Democrats profess to love, survive? This continuous and insidious encroachment upon the powers and rights of the States contravenes the most fundamental doctrine of the Democratic party; and as it seems to be the President's theory of the Government, I say that for that reason, in spite of the many good things that he has done, and in spite of the many noble impulses that he has had, he can never be a Democrat; and if our Republican friends console themselves with the delusion that they have ever lent him to us, then we give him back to them with our compliments. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I reserve whatever time I have left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has two minutes remaining which he reserves.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to take the floor in my own right, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized in his own time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a few observations on the subject of banking, and I want to say at the beginning that I am laboring under some embarrassment in undertaking to discuss this subject, for the reason that heretofore it has generally been conceded that no one had a right to any opinion upon any subject pertaining to banks or banking or

financial matters unless he was engaged in the banking business, and I know that what I say will be looked upon with suspicion and passed over lightly by many people, for the reason that it is a well-known fact that I am not a banker. And yet, Mr. Chairman, I believe that that idea that is so prevalent is absolutely wrong, and that I, as a matter of fact, should not be called upon to apologize for having ideas on this subject, even though they may be erroneous, simply because of the lack of money on my part to enter into the banking class.

The banking business is something that everybody, in a general way, in this country is interested in. There are, however, three classes of people who are particularly and directly interested in the business. First, there is the banker; second, the depositor, and third, the borrower.

Each one of these classes is interested in the business from honorable and lawful reasons, but at the same time it must be admitted that these reasons are all selfish. The banker is engaged in the business, not for philanthropic purposes, but for the purpose of making money for himself. The depositor puts his money in the bank, not because he is anxious to have the banker make money out of it, but because it is a convenience to him and enables him better to transact his business with checks and drafts. The borrower borrows the money which the depositor has put in the bank, not because he wants to assist the bank or accommodate the depositor, but because he anticipates a profit to himself out of the transaction; he expects to make more money on the loan than the interest he has to pay to the banker to obtain it.

It is quite clear, therefore, that the banker is not the only interested person in this class of legislation. It is equally clear that in legislating on the subject we should take into consideration the welfare of the other parties having a direct interest in the subject, and should not confine our attention entirely to looking after the interests of banks alone.

While I have never been, and in my fondest hopes and dreams have never hoped to become, a banker, I have occasionally been a depositor and many times a borrower. I feel, therefore, that while I may not be entitled to speak for or represent the banker in the consideration of the subject, I have a right to a respectful hearing at your hands as representing not only the people generally, but the depositor and borrower in particular. But, assuming that these three classes of people are equally honest—we should assume that they are honest, as most of them are, and we want particularly to legislate for those who are honest—it will be found that the interests of all are identical and that legislation which would prove beneficial to one class would be equally beneficial to each of the others. In a proper sense, however, we should scrutinize closely the demands of any class of people asking for legislation applying particularly to subjects in which they have a direct interest, as men, while perfectly upright, are frequently unwittingly prejudiced in matters pertaining to their own individual business and in which they have a direct interest, financially or otherwise. Bankers are beyond question as honest and intelligent as any other class of people, yet, like the rest of mankind, are subject to the weaknesses of human nature, and when we legislate upon a subject in which they have a direct financial interest we should look with the closest scrutiny upon their purposes and should take into consideration their financial interests in the contemplated legislation.

We should consider the subject from a broad standpoint. Realizing that their views may be warped unconsciously by their interests, bearing in mind that the people generally are interested in the proposed measure, and that the business of the entire country is affected by and connected with the banking business, these reflections should govern us in the consideration of any legislation we may enact on the subject.

The very foundation of the banking business is the depositor. Without the depositor there would of necessity be no banks. The banker would be deprived of his occupation and the business world would be compelled to resort to other methods of doing business. The depositor leaves his money with the bank only so long as he has faith and confidence, not only in the soundness and stability of the bank, but in his ability to obtain his money upon demand.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that we could not better advance the interests of the people generally and of the banks in particular than to guard safely the rights of the depositors. With that in view I have introduced a bill, H. R. 159, that I will print in my remarks at this point.

The bill is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 159) to secure the payment of depositors in national banks.

Be it enacted, etc., that within thirty days after the passage of this act every national bank engaged in the business of banking shall pay to the Treasurer of the United States one-fifth of 1 per cent of its de-

posits as shown by its last report to the Comptroller of the Currency. Any national bank organized prior to the passage of this act and subsequent to the last preceding report to said Comptroller shall pay to said Treasurer one-fifth of 1 per cent of its deposits on the day this act goes into effect.

On the 1st day of July annually after the passage of this act every national bank doing a banking business shall pay to said Treasurer one-fifth of 1 per cent of its average deposits for the preceding fiscal year as shown by the reports made to the Comptroller of the Currency during said year. Any national bank organized subsequent to the last report to the Comptroller of the Currency for that fiscal year shall pay said Treasurer one-fifth of 1 per cent of its deposits on the 30th day of June of said fiscal year. Any national bank organized after the passage of this act shall, before it is allowed to do a banking business, pay to said Treasurer one-fifth of 1 per cent of its paid-up capital stock.

SEC. 2. That the money so paid to the Treasurer of the United States as provided in section 1 of this act shall constitute a fund for the security of deposits in national banks and shall be under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall invest and disburse the same as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 3. That whenever a receiver shall be appointed for the purpose of closing up the affairs of any national bank, the Secretary of the Treasury, out of said fund, shall pay through said receiver all balances due depositors as soon as the amounts due can be ascertained, and thereupon the Secretary of the Treasury shall be subrogated to all the rights of said depositors and in the settlement of the affairs of such bank, all dividends that would have been due to said depositors shall be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the same shall be by him paid into and become a part of said fund: *Provided*, That no part of said fund shall be used for the payment of any deposit where the bank had given and the depositor accepted collateral security for the payment of same.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall invest said fund, or such part thereof as he may deem expedient, in the bonds of the United States, and in any future issue of Government bonds bearing not more than 2 per cent interest he shall have the right to purchase at par any part of the same with money belonging to said fund. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to sell any of said bonds belonging to said fund whenever it is necessary so to do for the purpose of paying depositors of insolvent national banks, as provided in section 3 of this act, and whenever, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, it shall be necessary to sell bonds belonging to said fund and there is any money in the Treasury of the United States available for the purpose of purchasing and retiring Government bonds, he is hereby authorized on the part of the Government of the United States to purchase from said fund at par any bonds that were originally purchased from the Government at par.

SEC. 5. That at the beginning of any fiscal year when the assessments hereinafter provided for shall become due and payable, no national bank shall be required to pay any part of its assessment that would make the total amount paid by it into said fund, after giving it credit for its proportionate share of the gain and deducting its proportionate share of the loss, exceed 2 per cent of its average deposits for the preceding fiscal year, as shown by its reports to the Comptroller of the Currency, and at said time if the amount theretofore paid into said fund by any national bank, after adding its proportionate share of the gain and deducting its proportionate share of the loss, is in excess of 2 per cent of its said average deposits for the preceding fiscal year, then the Secretary of the Treasury shall, out of said fund, pay said excess to said bank.

SEC. 6. That at the expiration of the charter of any national bank, should the same not be renewed or extended, or if any national bank shall desire to go into liquidation and cease doing banking business, after the payment by any such bank of all its depositors in full, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deduct from the total amount paid into said fund by such bank its proportionate share of the losses, if any, and pay to said bank out of said fund 90 per cent of the balance.

SEC. 7. That after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Treasury shall not deposit any of the money of the United States in any bank which has not complied with provisions thereof, and he is hereby authorized to deposit in any bank that has complied with the provisions of this act, without taking any collateral security therefor, any money belonging to the United States, not exceeding 5 per cent of the paid-up capital of said bank, and not exceeding in any case the sum of \$10,000.

SEC. 8. That if the Secretary of the Treasury shall be unable to invest the said fund hereby created by this act in the bonds of the United States, as provided by section 4 hereof, he shall be authorized to deposit not exceeding one-half of said fund in banks complying with this act: *Provided*, That not exceeding 5 per cent of the paid-up capital nor more than \$10,000 shall be deposited in any one bank: *And provided also*, That all such deposits shall draw interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum.

SEC. 9. That if any national bank shall refuse or neglect to pay its assessment within thirty days after the same shall become due, the said assessment shall draw interest at the rate of 10 per cent from the day the same became due, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall proceed to collect the amount due from said bank by due proceedings at law.

This bill provides for a guaranty of deposits in national banks by a fund which is raised by an assessment levied upon the banks in proportion to the average deposits. I have provided in section 1 that an annual assessment of one-fifth of 1 per cent shall be levied upon the average deposits in national banks as shown by their reports to the Comptroller of the Currency for the preceding fiscal year. In order that the law may have immediate force after its passage, I have provided that an assessment shall be made immediately upon the passage of the law. It seems to me that it is right that the assessment should be made upon the deposits rather than upon the capital stock, because it is the deposits that the bill undertakes to secure, and the bank therefore pays a rate in proportion to the risk assumed.

The only instance in the bill where banks would be required to pay an assessment on their capital stock would be in cases where banks are organized after the passage of the law. A bank that would be organized on the 2d day of July, for instance, if there were not some provision of this kind, would

not be required to pay any assessment until the 1st day of the next July, receiving one year's benefit of the law without being assessed therefor.

In order to avoid any discrimination of this kind it is also provided in section 1 that banks organized after the passage of the law shall pay the assessment on their capital stock, which constitutes their contribution to its guaranty fund, up to the beginning of the next fiscal year. The fund so raised is to be under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury, and in case of the failure of a national bank and the appointment of a receiver therefor the Secretary is authorized to immediately pay all the depositors of the insolvent bank, and he is subrogated to all rights of depositors, and dividends that are thereafter paid are paid into this fund instead of to the depositors. The fund thus created for the security of depositors is limited to 2 per cent of the average deposits in all national banks, and whenever a national bank has paid into this fund an amount that equals 2 per cent of its average balances, as shown by its report to the Comptroller of the Currency for the preceding fiscal year, its payments thereupon cease; and if at the beginning of any year it is found that the payments made to this fund by any bank exceed 2 per cent of its deposits, then the Secretary of the Treasury refunds to the bank this excess. This practically provides for a paid-up policy on the part of the bank.

It will be observed also that the fund created by this bill for the securing of deposits automatically increases or decreases as the deposits increase or decrease.

In my judgment the enactment of this law would not only absolutely secure depositors, but as a result there would be but few failures, and in case of a failure there would not likely be a loss to the fund, but only a temporary reduction of the fund by the withdrawal of sufficient money to pay off the depositors. It may be that one-fifth of 1 per cent is too high an assessment. I am inclined to think that one-tenth of 1 per cent would be sufficient. This is, however, a matter that is easily remedied and, as a matter of fact, is an unimportant item. When we take into consideration that a bank will be able to secure a paid-up policy for the protection of its depositors, it is not so very important what the rate of payment is; the aggregate sum paid by the bank would in any case be the same. It is well, however, to be on the safe side, and to have the assessment too high rather than too low, because under the provisions of the bill it would require several years before the fund created by it would assume such proportions that it would be regarded as absolute security, and therefore the larger the fund became the greater the security to the depositor, and therefore the greater benefit to business generally.

It would be well to consider also that when a bank reaches the stage of having paid up in full its proportionate share of this fund, the effect would at once be seen in the increased value of its stock. There can be no doubt but what the value of stock in a bank having a paid-up policy in this fund would be materially increased, so that it would be to the advantage of the bank, rather than otherwise, to pay its share of the fund as soon as possible.

If we pass this bill, or some similar bill, we eliminate from the banking business the greatest danger and the greatest peril that has heretofore assailed it. We would give to the country, and to the business all over the country, a firm foundation and a quietude that would not be disturbed by sudden flurries or by an occasional bank failure. The closing of a poor bank by the Government officials would not be followed by runs on good banks properly managed. The circulating medium of the country would not be affected and curtailed every time there is a bank failure or a perturbed money market, owing to the withdrawal of deposits and the hiding of money in secret places.

Objection has been made that a law of this kind would have a tendency to cause the good and careful banker to pay for the losses of the poor and reckless banker. It is also alleged in objection to this kind of legislation that the banker who has built up and established a business by efficient business methods would be placed on the same basis as the reckless plunger who has no regard for the rights of the people whose money he handles in his bank. While I do not believe these arguments are based on fact, but believe that absolutely the reverse would be shown to be true, yet it is a sufficient answer to say that the good banker is now, and always has been, at the mercy of the reckless banker. No one appreciates more than does the safe and careful banker the interference with his business and the injury to the same which is occasioned by the business tactics of the banker whose methods are, to say the least, questionable and unsafe.

The passage of this law would in no way change the individuality of banks or bankers; on the other hand, it would af-

ford to all of them a stability and inspire the people with a confidence they have never heretofore entertained. There is no doubt but that the Government officials often permit a shaky bank to continue doing business simply through the fear of disastrous results that the closing of such bank would have upon the good and substantial banks in the same vicinity. The passage of this bill would prevent such conditions, and when the Government officials discovered the unsafe condition of a bank, or when the officers of such bank refused to comply with the law or the demands of said Government officials, such bank would be immediately closed by Government authority, thus relieving not only the community at large, but the safe bankers in the vicinity of such bank. The Government could then act without fear of disturbing business or injuring innocent banks, and before the offending bank had gone so far in its reckless course as to cause loss to the depositor or to the stockholder.

The objectors to the proposed law assume that such law would be detrimental to banks, when, as a matter of fact, it should be perfectly apparent to them that the reverse would be the case. Whenever you remove the fear of the depositor, you place the banking business on a firmer and more substantial basis. It can never be placed upon such a basis until this fear is removed. In order to remove it you must convince him that his deposits are not only secure, but that they are at his command at any time. Such a law, by accomplishing such result, would not only bring relief to the country generally, but would be of the greatest financial benefit to the banker himself, and by opposing such legislation he is standing in his own light.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I would like to see every mercantile obligation in the country worth 100 cents on the dollar, of course. What is the proposition the gentleman makes—that the Government guarantee the deposits?

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Or that the deposits shall be guaranteed by a fund?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Collected from the bankers?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Does the gentleman as a lawyer think the United States Government has a right to tax one institution to make up the losses of another—not as a question of revenue at all, but purely for outside purposes?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, I will say, in answer to the gentleman. I believe Congress has the right to pass any law that would be a reasonable regulation of the banks.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Without regard to whether it is constitutional or not?

Mr. NORRIS. If it is an unreasonable regulation it would be unconstitutional, but if it is held to be a reasonable regulation it would be constitutional. In my judgment we can regulate the banks, and if we do not overstep the bounds of reason, the courts would hold that our law was constitutional.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Does the law provide for State banks as well as national banks?

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. It relates purely to national banks?

Mr. NORRIS. Only to national banks.

Mr. HARDY rose.

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas in a minute. The gentleman from Connecticut asks the question whether it is right to tax one man to pay the losses of another. I have just finished saying that in the banking business the good banker has always been paying the losses of the poor banker. The proposed assessment would lessen the payments of such losses in the future. The money that is paid into this fund would still remain as an asset of the bank.

To my mind the suggestion contained in the question of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] that this bill would compel one man to stand the losses suffered by another has no application whatever. In the first place, we must take into consideration the fact that a bank is a quasi-public institution. From the very nature of the case the banker, in order to make money, must have deposits. In other words, he makes his profits out of other people's money. The national bank must have a charter from the United States Government before it is allowed to do business. It is not only proper, therefore, but it is legal and right that the Government should prescribe by law the rules and regulations under which he shall be allowed to do business—under and by virtue of which he shall be allowed to receive the money of the people generally and to

handle it as his own. This is no new principle even in the national banking system. We have already provided by law for a great many rules and regulations controlling national banks. If we are to reject a law similar to the one I am discussing because it provides for the regulation of the banking business, then to be consistent we ought to repeal every other law that controls and governs national banks. Moreover, as suggested before, the assessment which the bank pays into this fund is still an asset of the bank.

It is part of the resources of the bank. It is in reality part of the property of the bank. When the Secretary of the Treasury invests it or deposits it, as provided in this bill, the banks get the benefit of the accretions by way of interest. As a matter of fact, there can be no valid objection made to this kind of a law on the ground that it will wrongfully assess one party for the payment of the debts of another. The banker himself will realize the greatest benefit—the financial profit will accrue more to the banker than to any other person. Under present conditions the banker who knows that across the street is another bank doing an unsafe business spends sleepless nights, haunted by the coming of the day when the unsafe bank shall fail and his bank thus be subjected to a run on the part of its depositors. However careful and honest he may have been, he knows that when that failure does come every depositor in his institution will be filled with fear and trembling, not necessarily because they fear his bank is unsafe, but because they realize that under such conditions it is the habit of people to become panicky about their funds, and there is a rush on the bank to withdraw the same.

This class of depositors, even though they may have no fear of the solvency of the bank, know that however solvent it may be it is liable to be compelled to close its doors on account of the unwarranted fears of other depositors, and such people are forced to take steps to defend themselves and supply themselves with ready money to do business by drawing out their money deposited in the bank. The banker who knows that some other bank in his town is liable to fail commences immediately to draw in his funds. He compels borrowers to pay their loans and refuses to make loans to others in order that he may prepare himself for the run which he anticipates when the other bank fails. He therefore not only suffers untold torment of mind, but his bank is unable to make the legitimate profit in the business to which it is honestly entitled. He has funds in his bank that he would gladly loan to the borrowers who make application therefor, but in order to be prepared for the fatal day he considers it unwise to grant such requests. He not only suffers in mind while his institution loses money on account of this condition of affairs, but the community of business men in his vicinity is deprived of the legitimate and proper right to borrow money out of the bank, and in this way the entire business of the community is affected and the money that should be circulating in the hands of the people is locked up in the vault awaiting the time when the other bank shall fail and when the anticipated run on the good bank shall begin.

There are several sections in this bill which might be considered as somewhat foreign to the subject, and which might be eliminated without interfering with the main object of the bill.

Section 8 provides how the Secretary shall invest the money constituting this fund. In my judgment it would be wise to give the Secretary of the Treasury a larger discretion in this matter than is provided in this section. I think it would be wise perhaps to provide for the depositing of a larger amount of this fund in the banks.

In section 7 it is provided that the Secretary of the Treasury can deposit any funds belonging to the Government in banks that have complied with this law without taking any security therefor except such as is given by this act, limiting

24009
such deposits, however, to not exceeding 5 per cent of the paid-up capital of any bank, and not exceeding in any case the sum of \$10,000.

This section, of course, could be eliminated from the bill without in any way interfering with it, but in my judgment it should remain, because by its provision the Secretary of the Treasury would be enabled to distribute the funds of the Government over the country and would not be compelled to confine himself to the larger banks and the larger cities, and, at the same time, it would give an illustration to the country at large that the Government itself had faith and confidence in the banks that have complied with the law, which would go a great way toward restoring confidence on the part of the people generally, and, at the same time, the Government would be absolutely protected and would run no risk whatever by such deposits.

While I believe the bill would be held to be constitutional

by the courts, yet if there be any serious doubt on this point and it were necessary to secure votes for its passage in the House, I would have no objection whatever to the striking out of section 9, the same being the section which provides for compulsory payment on the part of the banks of the assessment provided in the bill. In lieu of this section I would substitute another which would provide that the law should apply only to such banks as voluntarily accepted its provisions. There is no doubt but what if we provided that after the passage of the law national banks should have thirty days' time in which to decide whether they should accept or reject the provisions of the bill that practically every bank in the United States would avail itself of the opportunity to come in under this law, for the reason that it would mean a profit to them as well as security to the depositor.

This bill makes no provision for any banks except national banks. In my judgment it would be difficult for Congress to properly frame a law that would permit the coming in of State banks under its provisions, and even though it could do so, it would be doubtful whether it would be wise to permit such banks to avail themselves of the provisions of this law, for the reason that they are not subject to the laws of the United States, but are controlled and governed entirely by State laws. The enactment, however, of such a law on the part of Congress would, in my opinion, be followed by the enactment of a similar law in every State of the Union, so that in a short time all the banks of our country would be practically under the same law and governed virtually in the same way. Congress passed a pure-food law, but it was conceded that this law applied only to interstate commerce. Following closely upon the enactment of this national law by Congress the different States enacted the same or similar statutes, which applied to the respective States, thus making the system complete. The same rule would prevail, and, I believe, the same custom would be followed if we enacted this law.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HARDY. I believe I agree with the gentleman entirely in his proposition for the guaranty of these deposits, but is not the question of a tax or the levying of an assessment on the bank or on the deposits of the bank for the purpose of this guaranty just as much within the purview of the Constitution as the present practice of taxing the issue of bank notes?

Mr. NORRIS. I should think so.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. May I call the gentleman's attention to one thing? He thinks so, perhaps, but if he thinks twice he will not think so. The present tax is for revenue purposes and goes into the Treasury to meet the expenses of the United States Government. In this other case it is for an individual purpose, namely, to prevent the loss of a private concern.

The gentleman says that the bank deposits will undoubtedly increase when guaranteed. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that probably 90 per cent of all the deposits in the United States to-day in banks are the result of discounting of paper, and I would like to ask him whether, in his judgment, the discounting of paper would not enormously increase at the moment the paper was discounted and the proceeds put to the credit of the depositor? Does not the gentleman think there would be an enormous increase of the fictitious deposits if they were guaranteed the moment the fake paper was discounted and the proceeds placed to the credit of the so-called depositors?

Mr. NORRIS. From the gentleman's question I judge that such a proceeding would necessitate the consent of the bank to bring about those fictitious deposits.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. That is entirely true.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I would say there is not any danger in it. If the banker wants to bring about a fictitious deposit on which he has to pay an assessment, let him do it. I do not think there is any danger of a banker doing that, because his own protection would guard against it. Besides, such a procedure would be unlawful, and we have no right to assume that the banker would do an unlawful act, especially when it would be against his interest to do so. I do not believe there is any doubt in any man's mind who has ever witnessed a panic but what if the depositor was assured that there was no danger of losing his money a run on a bank would be something unknown, and just as soon as you do insure the depositor that he will not lose his money he is not going to take it out of the bank. We all know, too, in a general way, that there are millions of dollars in hiding now, and there always have been, and that this little flurry has been the means of hiding many more millions. If this law were passed, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that within thirty days money would come out of hiding

that has not before seen the light of day. Old stockings and old tin cans would be emptied, and yield up their golden treasure, and the money of the country would assume its legitimate and proper sphere in the channels of business and trade throughout the land. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. NEEDHAM in the chair). The Chair will be pleased to recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I am like the gentleman who has just taken his seat. I am not especially prepared to make any address upon the President's message at present, but there are some things that occur to me that seem to me to be nonpartisan and that seem only necessary to be brought to the minds of the people in order to command unanimous consent. If I can make one or two things so plain, so clear, that all men can see them, I shall have done all I hope to do.

I have attended within this last year numerous large meetings called in behalf of river and harbor and canal appropriations; and I believe that the greatest subject before the American people to-day for the advancement of the welfare of our country is the improvement of the rivers and harbors and inland navigation of this great land of ours. I want to say, however, that there is no possibility of ever making the inland navigation of the country a success until railroad regulation be first complete and perfect. I listened to the addresses of numerous members of these conventions; I heard the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of this House address one convention and use the expression that there ought to be some other weapon in the armory of the Government to regulate railroad freights than appropriating millions of dollars to afford paper or real water competition. His exact language was:

The motto of the railroad is to get business. If a water rate is established, rates are put down, and some people say, "We are in favor of river improvement; we don't care if a single boat don't go on the river." It's not worth while to make a \$10,000,000 improvement in a river along a railroad to make it lower its freight rate and behave itself. There ought to be in the armory of the law another authority which would compel that. So in the past when our rivers have been attempted to be improved, the railroads, instead of cooperating, have seen fit wherever proper terminals have been made and loading machinery provided, to immediately put down their rates from that point to such an extent as to discourage shipments by water from that point, and if possible lead to the abandonment and possible decay of terminals and any shipping on the river.

I want to call the attention of those Members of this House who will hear me, to certain conditions that exist to-day. I stood on the deck of a steamer running down the waters of the Mississippi for two whole days. What a glorious stream! Given us by nature! And yet I did not see one single barge floating or rolling upon those water carrying the freight of this great country of ours; a river that could carry millions and billions of tons, and yet its waters are unburdened by the freight of the land. And I saw railroads by its side loaded with saw logs even. What to-day prevents the carrying of freight on the great Mississippi River? Mr. BURTON said that as soon as any town perfected its landing facilities and the machinery to load and unload, just that soon the competition of the railroad was put into operation. In those towns that had water competition, they reduced their rates to such a point that boats could no longer travel the waters, and the boats were driven from the streams, the landing places were abandoned, the loading and unloading machinery sold or left to decay. Then the railroads raised their rates of freight. Sometimes they maintained very low rates between river points perpetually in order to prevent the establishment of water shipping routes, but while lowering rates between river points, they raised their rates to interior points so as to get the average rate that they desire to impose upon the people. Now let me state to the Members of this House the simple facts in this relation. I could state them in general terms. But in order to illustrate the general and universal practice of railroads, I will state them specifically. The freight rate on flour from St. Louis to Helena, Ark., is 20 cents a hundred, because St. Louis and Helena are both on the river. The freight rate from St. Louis to Paragould between those two places but away from the river is 60 cents a hundred pounds. Now, what is the matter? Paragould is 100 miles nearer St. Louis than Helena and freight from St. Louis to Helena by rail goes right through Paragould, yet in order to drive off freight-carrying vessels, railways will lower, and have lowered their rates to the competitive water point, Helena, and in order to recoup themselves the railroads are allowed to impose and have imposed high rates on the noncompetitive point, Paragould. The governor of Florida, addressing the Memphis convention, said that years ago he and his father owned a freight fleet on the St. Johns River, but soon after a railroad was built parallel to that river their landings and wharves were abandoned, the boats went off the river and were sold for junk, the railroads

carried the freight, and St. Johns River ceased to be navigated. Not only so, but you hear advocates of river improvement say, as cited by Mr. BURTON, "We want the river improved to give us water rates if a boat never goes down the river."

I want to say that I will not stand willing to vote for one dollar of improvement for a stream for only paper navigation, or just to give one city better railroad freight rates than another. It too frequently happens that great cities do not care what rates are charged so long as they are given special low rates as compared with other cities. Let me tell you, sir, I want to get good freight rates for the cotton of my State, and that is a very important matter to the farmers of our country. We raise 3,000,000 bales of cotton annually, and on that cotton we pay an average freight of \$2.50 per bale to carry it to the Gulf, a distance on the average of less than 300 miles. From my home to Galveston, which is about the average distance—260 miles—we pay 55 cents per hundred, or \$2.75, per bale, and from Memphis to New Orleans, 456 miles, the railroads only charge 17 cents per 100 pounds or 85 cents per bale. That is the difference in the freight on my cotton carrying it to the Gulf and the Memphis cotton carried nearly twice as far by the side of the Mississippi River. My countrymen, does the presence of the Mississippi River enable the railroads to carry freight any cheaper than they could if the river were not there at all? They carry a train load of cotton from Memphis to New Orleans, say 1,000 bales, and the freight charge is \$850. They take the same train and crew, the same engine, and the same cars and put them on the track at my home and carry the same amount of cotton only 260 miles, and when it gets to its destination the freight charge is \$2,750 or \$1,900 more.

When I ask a railroad man why he makes this discrimination between my town and Memphis, he says, "It is necessary to make that cheap rate in order to get business at Memphis." But, I ask him, "Do you want the business if it is not a profitable one?" If he has good sense enough to know that I know the truth when I hear it, he answers, "No." Then I ask him, "There was a profit in your transportation of that freight at \$850 per train load?" and he answers, "Yes." I ask him then, "Does the presence of the Mississippi River, with which you were competing, enable you to carry freight any cheaper? Did it make your cross-ties last any longer? Did it make your rails any better? Did it pay the wages of your brakemen or engineers, your firemen or conductors?" and he answers, "No." "Then you could handle that freight and haul it just as cheaply if the Mississippi were 1,000 miles away as you do to-day, could you not?" and he must say, "Yes." Strange that when last summer our State railroad commission reduced freight on cotton from my town to the Gulf from \$3 to \$2.75 per bale the railroads were ready to enjoin the commission and almost ready to swear the reduction would bankrupt them, and yet I say that if the railroads were not voluntarily bankrupting themselves in hauling cotton from Memphis to New Orleans at 85 cents per bale, they were and are robbing the people of Texas in charging them \$2.75 per bale. Whenever the laws of our land recognize that railroad rates are to be regulated according to the value of the service performed, and not according to the contiguity of rivers or waterways, then they will begin to start aright upon the question of railroad regulation and inland water navigation. And I want to tell you when railroads are by law forbidden to lower their freight rates between water points in order to break up water transportation and to recoup themselves by raising rates at interior points, you will have done more to navigate the Mississippi and our inland streams in a day by the passage of that law than you will by voting hundreds of millions of dollars for the improvement of your river transportation. [Applause.]

So far as actually navigating the Mississippi between the city of St. Louis and New Orleans, if the present policy of railroad rates is to be continued, every dollar that has been expended on that river by the Government had just as well be cast into the sea. Listen to what Mr. Vance, chairman of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, said at Memphis:

Ten years from the introduction of steam navigation on the Mississippi the whole West was a scene of active enterprise. The rich products of the West were gathered from the remotest tributaries of the Ohio on the east, and from the Red River on the west, and were transported by hundreds of magnificent steamers, traversing every river and every great stream between the Allegheny ranges on the east and the Rocky Mountains on the west. Gentlemen, where to-day are the hundreds of magnificent steamers traversing the Mississippi laden with the rich treasures of the Ohio and Red rivers? Is there one steamer plying between New Orleans and St. Louis, where 7 miles of paved wharf awaits its coming anxiously? Is there, in fact, one steamer plying between New Orleans and Memphis? When the *Orleans*, in the very early years of the nineteenth century steamed down the Ohio, her whistle sent the noble red man scampering from the banks of the river to the thickest woods when its echoes shrieked at every bend. To-day, and I say it in all kindness, the noble red man might line the banks of the Mississippi in peace, so far as the whistle of a steamer

on the river is concerned, unless the steamer bore the brand of the Ohio on her pennant, for none others ply our waters in the through trade from the great city of St. Louis to New Orleans.

I want to add, from what I saw, that if the red man wasn't full of imagination he wouldn't often be scared by any Ohio steamers, for I sat on the open deck of a steamer for two whole days, moving from St. Louis to Memphis, and during that time saw not one freight-laden vessel, and yet the Mississippi is capable to-day of carrying more freight than almost any of our rivers will or ever can be made, but she is a useless, slumbering giant.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to some few other facts currently known. The railroads in the State of Georgia, to transport rock from the quarries of north Georgia charge 20 per cent more than they do to transport rock from the Vermont quarries down to north Georgia. Attention was called to this fact in that hot campaign of last year in your State [turning to Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia], and it was shown that those quarries from Vermont furnished rock for southern Georgia with cheaper freight than the quarries from north Georgia, 1,000 miles nearer home could do it. Why? Because the quarries from Vermont might load their rock on the Connecticut River and carry it to the Atlantic Ocean and then up the little streams to your south Georgia building towns, and in order to kill that transportation by water the railroads arbitrarily reduced the rates of freight from the Vermont quarries through to Georgia and raised their rates on the helpless north Georgia quarries to recoup themselves, as they do the freight on other commodities to other helpless points. Only the other day C. S. E. Holland, president of the Intercoastal Canal Association, at Victoria, Tex., said at Houston, Tex.:

There is one question that is deserving of the most careful and considerate attention at the hands of this convention, and that is the question of craft for navigation after we receive the waterway. I received a letter some time since from an old citizen living near Matagorda. He inclosed a clipping from a Brazoria newspaper, which contained the information that the railroads were charging 25 cents per 100 for shipping cotton from Brazoria to Galveston, the gin being located on a river bank, the river with a sufficient depth and a connection with our canal at Velasco so that boats can now carry it to Galveston, but no boats to carry it and the result was that a haul of 1 mile to the railroad station over bad roads was necessary. This gentleman stated that he had experience in putting on a boat and reducing the rate in a similar case, but that so soon as the railroad met the rate, he was left without tonnage and was compelled to sell his boat for less than half its cost, because he could not make a living with the small amount of freight he could procure. He further stated that the railroads would put the old rates back again so soon as the boats are eliminated.

Mr. Holland urges the formation of a sort of volunteer association of patriotic citizens, who would guarantee and furnish tonnage to the shipowner even when the roads were offering to ship cheaper, but surely no student of human nature believes such plan possible. To depend on men in any city using boats when it is to their pecuniary interest to use railroads shows strong faith, but I fear very little knowledge. The truth is that the railroad capital of this country has got the private citizen by the throat, and is allowed under our laws to shake him as it pleases and to take from him, under railroad tariffs, just what it will. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, if we are to start right the slate should be wiped off, and I defy any man to show me where last year's legislation has yet resulted in the reduction of any freight rates. In fact, it is about admitted that since the action of last Congress the railroads have been making a concerted raise in rates under claim of necessity for increased expenditure to enable them to handle the freight. Yet, even last fall, at a time when it was claimed there was a congestion of freight and a dearth of cars and no way to transport our freight, and when James J. Hill was appearing to champion waterway improvement and urging the necessity of extravagant railroad bond issues to build or better equip roads, at that very time the Southern Pacific Railroad Company applied to the Commission at New Orleans for leave to reduce their rates on cotton from 18 to 12 cents a hundred pounds. Why? They wanted to get the little traffic that was going down the bayou from Houston to Galveston and then across the Gulf. They wanted to cut that out. They could ship over 300 miles from Houston—from Houston to New Orleans—for 12 cents a hundred pounds, but they demanded 55 cents a hundred pounds for 260 miles of transportation from my town, and were threatened, as they said, with bankruptcy because they were not allowed to charge 60 cents.

It is a great and absolute truth that no railroad can haul any given commodity, in a given quantity, through any place cheaper than it can haul it to that place. We have on our statute books a law which says in substance that no railroad shall charge more for hauling freight to a place than through it, or more for a short haul than for a long haul; but there is added to that the ingenious phrase, "provided conditions are similar," and

whenever you get a railroad before a court in order to justify a greater charge for a short haul than a long haul they can always show that conditions are not the same, and they actually boldly present to courts, as a right they claim, that in order to "get business" they ought to be allowed to lower their rates at possible water-competing points and raise them at noncompeting points to recoup themselves or to support themselves while they are crushing out competition. They do not use these words, but that is what their claim means; and stranger than the claim is the fact that courts declare "the law allows and the court doth award the right," and courts allow pronounced in their presence without rebuke the monstrous doctrine that the railroads' only rules by which to fix rates are, first, "to get business," and second, "to tax the traffic all it will bear." If railroads are required to compete with waterways all along their line—that is, to fix rates at their water-competing points no lower than they do at noncompeting points—then if they take the traffic it is well. It simply shows that railroads can ship cheaper than waterways; but that is not true, and none know it better than the railroads. Given fair competition and the railroads will haul the costly and perishable freight and water will haul the cruder stuffs—coal, logs, coke, timber, etc.—at one-fifth the cost railroads can afford to haul them. Under the cutthroat competition heretofore all water transportation has been destroyed and not a river, not a canal in the United States is freely used. I say that if we should introduce and pass a bill which will provide that no railroad shall ever charge more for hauling a given quantity of freight of a given character to a place than they do through that place and beyond it, you will cut off more charges that are wrong and which are imposed upon and collected from the people than the salaries of all the officials of the Government would amount to per annum. I have introduced just that bill—H. R. 4801.

My countrymen, I want the people of America to take up this question. I would like to see the Congress of America lead in that respect, and not wait till they are driven by an outraged public opinion, after the people have dumped their millions into unnavigated rivers. This is a nonpartisan question; this is a patriotic question, and every man who wants simple justice done to the great mass of the American people and wants to take from one special class the power of levying, at will, a tax upon the shoulders of the people, will join in some effort to bring about this legislation. [Applause.] Now, we are talking about building a canal from Chicago down to the Mississippi, on by St. Louis to Memphis, and the purpose is to lower the freight rates to Chicago, St. Louis, New Orleans, and the big river cities. The purpose should be to stop the discrimination in railroad freights between different cities based on the "Get business and tax the traffic all it will bear" doctrine, and by increasing freight-carrying facilities and giving cheaper transportation by water to cruder commodities, to lower freight rates all over this land. I received a communication from the Oklahoma Traffic Association, with a call for an inland communities convention, in which they say much lower charges are made to and from cities on navigable, or so-called navigable, streams than to interior towns, the freight often being handled right through the latter towns, and they detail instances where inland towns are penalized in order to meet or keep down navigation, but even they do not seem to grasp the idea of their true remedy. They fear fake navigation, fake waterways, fake competition; what they need to fear is the fake pretext by railroads that they can and have a right to charge less from water competitive points and more from nonwater competitive points. They may be sure that no mere paper navigation will ever reduce rates unless the railroads reduce them from fear that the paper navigation will become real navigation or from other selfish motives.

Let me give you a further illustration of this matter. This is pertinent and germane. In the southeast of Texas there exists a vast forest of long-leaf yellow pine, the best building material that God ever caused His sun to make grow, and this pine is being cut and sawed into lumber and fast destroyed. The railroads approaching that vicinity came together and they agreed upon a freight rate, and they charged the people of Texas a higher rate of freight on that lumber than they do the people of Illinois and the Middle West. What is the matter? From Beaumont to my town the freight on lumber is 18½ cents a hundred pounds, and to Memphis, right by my door, the rate is 16 cents per hundred pounds—nearly \$2 a thousand feet more to take the lumber from the mills of Texas and lay it down at the door of the Texas inhabitant than they charge to take the same lumber and carry it to a far-distant State and lay it down for consumption there. The children of Illinois—and I say it in all kindness—have no right to build their homes out of lumber grown in Texas, under the protection of the laws of

Texas—I say they have no right to build their homes cheaper than we, the sons of Texas, may build it of the same lumber. [Applause.] Your railroads operate to reverse the laws of tariff, and instead of protecting each locality and preserving its natural advantages, its production and its commerce, it carries away our products and transports them to alien and foreign States, and raises the price of commodities to the home consumer by placing upon his shoulders the burden of carrying the commodities to distant lands and discriminating against him in favor of the alien.

We ask for justice. Let every community have the right of its own proximity, the rights that have by some legerdemain been taken away from them. We stand in the position of the poor fellow in the Bible—and it is proper, since it is the fashion to-day to quote the Bible now—who had but 1 talent and who hid it away, and even that which he had was taken away from him. If we do nothing to protect our rights and improve our advantages [laughter]; if we stand by and see our birth-right turned over to another without a fight, I think I see more clearly than ever before the justice of the treatment of that fellow in the parable who had but 1 talent and didn't know what to do with that. [Applause.] And we poor Democrats down in Texas have too little. We had our lumber, we had our timber, and we had our public domain; we gave that to the railroads, or largely so; we had our lumber; we thought it was ours yet, but the millmen went before our commission and said to them openly, "If you reduce the freight on lumber to points in Texas, we will raise the price of it, and the people shall not get the benefit of it." I thought it was a great lumber trust combining with a great railroad trust—they certainly made a noise like it—and when the railroad men came before the State commission to resist reduction of rates on lumber we found representatives of the lumber mills with them, standing shoulder to shoulder, and urging the railroad commission of Texas not to reduce the rates of freight on lumber to points in Texas. A strange contention for them. Then I began to figure it out to see what was the matter, and I found that those vast mills and fields of magnificent timber sought a wider market so that they could go out to the broad prairies of the Middle West, and in an unlimited demand for lumber raise prices from day to day and week to week, as they did, while if they were confined by the freight rates to Texas only their consumption would possibly not reach their production and prices might go down.

So the railroad men and the lumber men combined, and the lumber man joined the railroad man to resist the reduction of freight, and we found them shoulder to shoulder and arm in arm, threatening the people and the commission if they should seek to regulate freight rates. And so the Texan pays the added freight to reach a wider field of demand in order to raise the price of the lumber he must buy. This vast country of ours has seen the railroads grow and prosper, as in God's name I would have them do, but I want to tell you when you see such fortunes builded up as have been built up in the manipulation of stocks and bonds and the reorganization of railroad companies so that in a generation a Harriman and a Morgan and a Ryan can arise, it is time to pause—men who count their wealth, not by the thousands or millions even, but who may say that the dollars that represent the wealth of which they are possessed are as numerous as the sands on the seashore or the stars in the firmament; that when that is true under the operation of any system or any civilization, it behooves the men who think for the people to stop, to give pause and see if some remedy can not be had. What I appeal to this House for is the passage of the law—and you will find in all the inland points where the people meet together that they indorse it—that shall say to the railroad companies, you shall not charge more for the short haul than for the long one, and leave off your conditions. Say, by law, you shall not charge more to haul to Corsicana than you do to haul through Corsicana to Memphis, 700 miles farther; you shall not charge more to haul from St. Louis to Paragould than you do to haul a hundred miles farther, through Paragould on to Helena—not three times as much, any way. I simply ask that the thinkers of Congress—and I want to say that it does not depend on whether they are Republicans or Democrats, for there are as many Republicans in this land of ours who are suffering from the injustice of wrong freight rates as Democrats—I want to say to the thinkers that I do not believe your commission can very perfectly regulate, say, ten millions of specific freight rates, but this Congress can pass laws establishing just and great principles that must not be violated, and that will be self-enforcing.

I have introduced several bills which seem to me of this character—one a bill requiring cooperation between railroads and waterways; one to prevent railroads raising rates without con-

sent of the Interstate Commerce Commission; one to prevent monopoly in transportation on waterways, but the chiefest of these is the long and short haul bill which I have mainly discussed.

Mr. Chairman, I have said more than I had any idea of saying when I arose, and I should not have addressed this assembly to-day but for the fact that the message I have tried to give comes with me from my people. In every village of my district I talked the matter over with our people, and I have yet to find the first one who believes that it is right or just, or ought to be permissible, for a railroad to tax at will the helpless intermediate points in order that they might kill out all water navigation and have the monopoly of transportation. I have talked with Members of this House from the East and from the West, from the North and from the South, and they all tell the same tale of unjust discrimination and destruction of water traffic in their sections, and House bill No. 4801 will pass if it ever reaches a vote.

I append herewith as a part of my remarks the following:

A bill (H. R. 4801) to prohibit railroad companies from charging a greater freight rate for transportation for short distances than for longer distances covering the same and additional track mileage for the same commodities and class of freight in the same quantities.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after January 1, 1909, it shall be unlawful for any railway company or companies acting together to charge a greater rate of freight per pound, per 100 pounds, per ton, or per carload for hauling any kind, class, or commodity of freight in any given quantity and any given method or manner over any given part and portion of the roads owned, operated, or controlled by them covering the distance between two points located upon said road or roads than shall be charged by said company or companies acting jointly per pound, per 100 pounds, per ton, or per carload for hauling the same kind, class, or commodity of freight in the same given quantity and the same given method and manner a greater distance, which greater distance shall include the given shorter distance and identical part and portion of said road or roads.

Sec. 2. That this statute shall apply to all shipments of foreign or interstate commerce and no other.

Sec. 3. That any intentional violation of any of the provisions of this act by any officer, agent, or employee of any railroad company be punished by imprisonment for not more than one year nor less than one month.

A bill (H. R. 11354) to prohibit railroad companies from raising the freight rate on any class or commodity of interstate freight without first submitting their action so raising such rate to the Interstate Commerce Commission and securing its approval thereof.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any railway company engaged in the transportation of interstate commerce to amend or alter its schedule of freight rates as to any articles of interstate commerce or any class or commodity of freight which shall fall within the meaning of interstate commerce in any manner whatsoever, that the effect thereof would be to raise the cost of transportation of such article of commerce, or such class or commodity of freight, or in any manner to change or alter their classification of freight or any conditions of shipment of same so as to raise the cost of the transportation thereof to the shipper without first having obtained the consent and permission of the Interstate Commerce Commission to such advance rate and cost.

Sec. 2. That such consent and permission shall only be granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission upon application of the railroad company or companies desiring the same and after due notice given of such application in accordance with rules and requirements hereafter to be prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that said Interstate Commerce Commission shall in all cases, after due notice and hearing, grant or refuse the application so made as in their judgment shall seem right and just, and that the action and decision of such Commission thereon shall be conclusive and final, but shall not be taken to defeat the right of such railway company or companies to make a second application in the same manner as the first, nor in any manner to prevent a subsequent lowering of such freight rate or charge for transportation, such lowering to be made in any lawful manner or upon any lawful order of the Commission: *And provided further,* That this act shall not in any manner be construed to deny the right to any railway company or companies, by mandamus, to compel said Interstate Commerce Commission to grant such permission in any case in which they may be shown to be in equity entitled to such mandamus from any court of lawful and competent jurisdiction.

A bill (H. R. 11346) to compel and require railroad companies to cooperate with shippers upon inland navigable waterways.

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter all railway companies whose lines of transportation shall cross or lie in close proximity to any inland navigable river, stream, lake, or canal shall be required to make and provide reasonable and proper connecting facilities for the transfer of freight from any such stream, river, lake, or canal to and upon their said road and for the transfer of freight from any such road or roads to the wharves, landing, and loading places upon such rivers, streams, lakes, and canals whenever and wherever ordered so to do by the Interstate Commerce Commission and under such reasonable terms and conditions as shall be ordered by such Commission, after due and reasonable notice and hearing, and such railroad company or companies shall be required to receive any such freight from such shipper upon such rivers, streams, lakes, and canals and to deliver freight to such rivers, streams, lakes, and canals for transportation in the same manner and under the same regulations as they are now required to receive freight from and deliver freight to connecting railroads: *And provided further,* That all railroads be required, at the election of any shipper, to receive and carry freight from any point to any such waterway connecting points and to ship the same via such waterway at the request of the shipper and to give through bill of lading therefor to the shipper just as is now done in case of shipment over two or more connecting railroads: *And provided further,* That the charge for any such ship-

ment, in the aggregate, that is, the combined charges for rail and water transportation, shall in no case exceed the sum of the separate rates for the transportation of such shipments by water and by rail over the respective water and rail routes over which same may be transported.

A bill (H. R. 11355) to prevent combinations and monopolies for the destruction of fair and legitimate competition upon inland waterways.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall hereafter be unlawful for any person or persons, any firm or corporation, with the purpose and intent of destroying competition and acquiring a monopoly of transportation upon any of the inland waterways of the United States, to charge a less freight rate for the transportation of any interstate commerce upon any such waterways than will be sufficient to afford to the carrier a reasonable and proper profit and reward upon his capital and labor invested and performed in the transportation of such commerce.

Letter of W. V. Hardie, secretary of Inland Communities Convention, also resolutions of Farmers' National Congress of September, 1907.

OKLAHOMA TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION,
Oklahoma City, Okla., October 31, 1907.

HON. RUFUS HARDY, M. C., Corsicana, Tex.

DEAR SIR: I thank you sincerely for the full expression of your views on the waterway and transportation questions of the day as outlined in your letter of 28th instant.

You may rest assured that our primary object in joining in the call for this convention is to oppose unjust discrimination in freight rates by railroads. It is my idea that as nearly as possible all railway rates should be put upon a mileage basis, not necessarily, you understand, upon a mileage scale, but that the distance and character of the service performed should be the principal factor in determining rates. We are not in any sense opposed to the improvement of waterways which are capable of actual regular and continuous transportation of freight in a manner to satisfy the demands of present-day commerce.

It is, however, our firm belief that the present theories of rate making by rail carriers as based on so-called water competition are entirely wrong and unjust to the majority of the people of the Western States. We believe that water-competition rates should be made only between the points between which actual water transportation exists, and then only on commodities which can actually be transported by water. You are no doubt thoroughly familiar with the practice of railroads to make much lower rates from and to such favored so-called water points as Fort Smith, Kansas City, Omaha, and Little Rock, mile for mile, than they make from and to inland towns like Fort Worth, Oklahoma City, Wichita, Lincoln, and the thousands of smaller places similarly situated. This condition exists not only on freight which might under certain favorable conditions be transported by boat, but on all classes and commodities, including vegetables, fruits, potatoes, and other perishable freight, which would never be moved by boats when possible to ship by rail, no matter what difference in rate existed between the two routes. We believe that railroads should not be permitted to make these low rates to and from favored points, charging inland towns enough to make up to them what they lose in these instances. On the other hand, we do not see why one point is entitled to any better rates, service considered, than another, but believe that all points should be put upon substantially the same basis, which should be fixed as low as possible, leaving to the carrier a fair remuneration for the service performed.

To explain our position a little more clearly, will give an illustration. The rates in window glass in carloads from the numerous glass factories in southeastern Kansas to the points shown are as follows:

	Cents.
To Kansas City; average distance, 165 miles.....	20
To Wichita; average distance, 120 miles.....	20
To Oklahoma City; distance, 200 miles.....	32
To Fort Worth; average distance, 400 miles.....	70
To Corsicana; average distance, 550 miles.....	75
To Houston; average distance, 700 miles.....	45

Though there is absolutely no water competition from these factories to either Kansas City or Houston, you will see that both of them have much better rates per mile than any of the other points named. These low rates are made on a paper theory that as these favored points are so-called water points on traffic from other directions, that they should also have low rates from western territory to meet the competition of eastern glass factories. You will readily see that if the railroads make any money hauling glass 700 miles to Houston for 45 cents, they certainly make an extortionate profit on a 400-mile haul to Fort Worth and a 550-mile haul to Corsicana at the rates named. It is our idea that all of these rates should be re-arranged to make a resultant basis fair to all, which would give rates about as follows:

	Cents.
Wichita.....	20
Kansas City.....	24
Oklahoma City.....	28
Fort Worth.....	55
Corsicana.....	60
Houston.....	65

Numerous other examples of similar cases could be given, for this is but an illustration of the general theory of rate making in the West, and it is this general theory that we seek to overthrow.

Our position is well outlined by the resolutions adopted by the Farmers' National Congress of America which met at Oklahoma City a couple of weeks ago, of which I attach copy hereto.

This general subject is one of vital interest to this western country and particularly as you have given the matter study, we hope that you will meet with us at Wichita and give us the benefit of your views and experience in Congress.

Very truly, yours,

W. V. HARDIE, Secretary.

Resolutions adopted by Farmers' National Congress, September, 1907.

Whereas it is agreed that the freight problem is one of the most important before the people of this country to-day, and we believe that the public should be educated to a proper solution of the problem; and

Whereas we believe that the improvement of waterways will partially solve the transportation problems of the day by affording additional means to transport a portion of the present congested traffic on our railroads; and

Whereas we believe that great care should be exercised in carrying

out this great work that the people's money be expended only where such relief to freight congestion may be reasonably expected; and

Whereas numerous appropriations are being and will be sought for the improvement of waterways which can not afford such relief, but are desired only with a view to obtaining from the railways lower freight rates for a few communities at the expense of the people at large; and

Whereas we believe that the true solution of the rate-regulation problem lies with the Congress of the United States through the Interstate Commerce Commission and through the various State railway commissions, which have power to grant just and fair rates to all, thus saving to the people the vast sums of money needed to improve many small streams: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Farmers' National Congress in convention assembled, That we favor the improvement of such waterways as have been or are susceptible of being made actual mediums of regular and permanent transportation, of a character to supply the demands of present commerce.

Resolved further, That we earnestly request the Congress of the United States to so amend the interstate-commerce act that the common carriers can not set up water competition as a defense for ignoring the "long and short haul clause" and for making freight rates to and from one section lower than to another, service considered, unless such water competition is susceptible of being maintained continuously and permanently.

Resolved further, That the interstate-commerce law should be so amended as to declare that when a through rate is higher than a combination of two or more local rates it shall be prima facie evidence that the through rate is too high and that the combination rate should be considered the reasonable rate for future application.

And resolved further, That we are unalterably opposed to legislation which aims to control common carriers by interfering with State control or by overriding State laws or regulations, as such legislation will work a hardship to our agricultural interests and an injustice to the law-abiding people of the separate States.

Letter written by Rufus Hardy to W. V. Hardie, secretary executive committee Oklahoma Traffic Association, but which reached Wichita after the inland communities convention had adjourned and was never delivered.

NOVEMBER 14, 1907.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OKLAHOMA TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION,

W. V. HARDIE, Secretary, Wichita, Kans.

GENTLEMEN: I am in receipt of your letter of November 9, addressed to me at Corsicana. I sincerely regret my inability to be with you and address your convention. My estimate of the importance of your convention has been heretofore stated to you, and I would give much of my personal time and effort if I could begin to get impressed upon the people and lawmakers the absolute necessity of preventing discrimination between cities and of utterly and entirely ignoring water facilities in fixing railway rates. Freight rates should be absolutely based upon the value of the service rendered. Discrimination for supposed advantage of certain localities must be absolutely abolished. If the railroads are given the merest pretext or the slightest permission to make any discriminations, we will continue and surely continue to have favored and nonfavored points. Your statement, "It is a fact that to-day even on the great Mississippi practically no freight moves by boat," is absolutely true and will remain true until the wisdom and necessity of my proposition prevails over the greed of railways and great-favored cities. I did not know what percentage of freight handled on rivers to-day was carried by boat lines owned by the shippers and maintained for the sole purpose of keeping down railroad freights, but your statement that a great percentage of it is so owned only confirms what I have repeatedly contended, to wit, that the railroads have purposely and designedly killed water transportation and have been blindly permitted to do so by our laws, which authorize them to make any kind of rates to and from water competitive points and to tax the noncompetitive points by way of recompense.

I go further and state that they make these low rates even to places where there never has been a boat upon the stream and on commodities that never would be carried by boats if the boats were there in order to keep such places from interesting themselves in the installation of actual water transportation, and that they have thereby secured, unconsciously, it may be, the cooperation of great cities, or at least their acquiescence in their discrimination, which, while killing water transportation, gives to such cities unjust advantage and to the roads entire monopoly of transportation. I pray for the strength to impress these great truths, as they ought to be impressed, upon Congress, upon legislatures, and upon courts. The two rules and the only two rules by which railroads are governed, as they admit and avow, in fixing freight rates, are, first, "to get business;" second, "to tax the traffic all it will bear." And these two rules should provoke the righteous indignation of every man, true to the people, who has sense enough to understand their workings. I hope to help build up a real inland waterways system of freight transportation. I hope to see the bulk of such freight as coal, cement, brick, hard woods, iron ore, and all cheap and perishable products carried largely by water. And they constitute about 65 per cent of the total tonnage now carried by rail. I hope thereby to see the actual transportation facilities of our country trebled and quadrupled within a few years; to see railroad freight congestion a thing of the past, and to see all freight rates reduced to a rational basis, under the firm regulation and limitation fixed by law; to see inland cities surrounded by local favoring conditions build up, and prosper, as their energy and God's gift entitle them to. Every statement I have made might be a text for illustration, elaboration, and appeal before our lawmaking bodies and for the enforcement of the proposition you make in these words: "What we need is a general uniform system of rates, based on the service performed by the railroads."

Sincerely, yours,

RUFUS HARDY.

Member of Congress, Sixth District, Texas.

Letter of William Gwaltney, cashier Bank of Gordonsville, Gordonsville, Tenn.

BANK OF GORDONSVILLE,

Gordonsville, Tenn., December 16, 1907.

Hon. RUFUS HARDY, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Washington correspondent to the Nashville Banner of November 21 gave a sketch of your views on the railroad freight question. In my opinion there is no subject upon which national legislation is needed worse.

The Southern Railroad charges about twice as much per hundred to ship from Nashville to this place as it does to ship to Carthage, 6 miles beyond on the same road. The courts condemn rebates to individuals, but allow unjust discrimination against different points to pass unnoticed. This discrimination is more evil and unjust in its workings than rebating. Making a long haul for less than a short one forces the shipper at intermediate points to pay excessive rates to replace the loss sustained by the long haul. This unjust practice allows the railroads to rob one customer and give it to another. It would be almost impossible for the States to regulate this evil, but a very short law by the National Congress could set this matter right. A law to prohibit a long haul for less than a short one on the same line would allow railroads to compete with other transporting lines if they wished to, without injustice to others. I think you are on the right road. I think the people have a right to ask for protection against this evil practice.

Respectfully,

WM. GWALTNEY.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, as we are in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, considering the message of the President of the United States, it is my desire to make a few remarks upon two phases of the message, and as a basis for what I have to say quote from the message these paragraphs:

A combination should not be tolerated if it abuse the power acquired by combination to the public detriment. No corporation or association of any kind should be permitted to engage in foreign or interstate commerce that is formed for the purpose of, or whose operations create, a monopoly or general control of the production, sale, or distribution of any one or more of the prime necessities of life or articles of general use and necessity.

When the Department of Agriculture was founded there was much sneering as to its usefulness. No Department of the Government, however, has more emphatically vindicated its usefulness.

The two citizens whose welfare is in the aggregate most vital to the welfare of the nation, and therefore to the welfare of all other citizens, are the wage-worker who does manual labor and the tiller of the soil—the farmer.

No growth of cities, no growth of wealth, can make up for any loss in either the number or the character of the farming population.

Farmers must cooperate with one another and with the Government, and the Government can best give its aid through associations of farmers.

These expressions of the President touch on subjects of vital importance to the American people.

From the time the simple shepherd led his confiding flock over the Judean plains until now, when the great harvesting machines cut and bind and thrash the grain in the field, the people of the rural districts have fed and clothed the world.

In the early morn of the world the meats and skins of goats and sheep furnished food and raiment for mankind, and to-day the great Webb steam compress presses the cotton produced by the farmers into the smallest possible space and it is sent to the remotest bounds of the earth.

Beef which comes from the rural districts is embalmed in the great packing houses, and with pork and beans travels over the broad ocean and across the high seas.

Whether we be robed in silk and fine purple, or dressed in linen, cotton, or skins, our apparel must first pass through the hands of the sturdy yeoman. The cornodger, rolled oats, rice pudding, and poundcake have all been through the farmer's bin.

The commercial milk which nourishes the infant, the compound lard which nauseates the adult, and the prophylactic fluid which disinfects the dead all originate with our friend, Agricola.

Agriculture is the basis for all other industries; as the ebb and flow of the tide in the ocean, so other industries rise and fall with the prosperity and the adversity of the farmer.

The farmers of America not only feed and clothe the people of this country, but they supply one-third of the grain and three-fourths of the cotton used by the entire world. After feeding and clothing this country the farmers of America furnish annually over \$800,000,000 worth of their products to foreign customers.

In this country alone over 2,000,000 people are dependent upon manufacturing for a living. If some great calamity should prevent the farmers from making a crop these people would be overwhelmed; woe and want would go hand in hand; misery and destitution would stalk in the land.

If the boll weevil should destroy the entire cotton crop of the country, hundreds of thousands of manufacturing people in this country and in Europe would be thrown out of employment and their hungry throats would send up a wail of lamentation for bread.

For this fiscal year there has been appropriated by Congress \$250,000 to circumvent the ravages of the boll weevil, \$150,000 to destroy the cattle tick, about \$50,000,000 for the benefit of the rivers and harbors of the country, in all of which measures the farmers are directly interested. The first agricultural appropriation bills passed by Congress carried \$1,000 annually. Now these bills aggregate over \$7,000,000 annually.

Not only do I favor these increased appropriations for the benefit of the farming class of people, but I want millions added to the list for good roads, signal-service reports, food inspection, and I want to see the post-office appropriation bills

provide for the establishment of rural free-delivery routes all over the country.

I stood with the farmers and laboring people in their demands for the railroad rate bill which prevented discrimination in freight rates and prevented officers from riding on passes, the bill which provided for the investigation of the New York and the New Orleans cotton exchanges, with a view of checking the gambling in cotton futures; the pure-food law, the denatured alcohol bill, which was intended to afford cheaper light and fuel and lessen the evil of the Standard Oil Company's iniquitous monopoly; for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people, and the bill preventing corporations from contributing campaign funds.

That the great insurance companies should pay their presidents \$100,000 and \$150,000 per annum without the consent of the policy holders, whose money they were spending, was bad enough, but when they paid \$50,000 each into the Republican campaign fund and took this money from the widows and the orphans of the unsuspecting policy holders it was time to call a halt.

But the money power has become so bold and its brazen effrontery so audacious as to strike with terror the well-meaning citizen, whose chief desire is to be allowed to quietly pursue the peaceful avocations of life.

While wealth, per se, is desirable and the proper use of wealth is greatly to be commended, still when enormous sums of money are accumulated for the purpose of corrupting the electorate and for the purpose of converting a democracy into a plutocracy it is time for the people to raise their hands in holy horror. But when these enormous sums of money enable the individual and the corporations possessing them to form trusts in restraint of trade, stifling competition and strangling to death those weaker than they who are endeavoring to make a legitimate living, it is high time for the American people to cast about for a remedy to save themselves from being engulfed in this vortex of certain destruction.

When these trusts are formed the weaker individuals and business concerns coming in competition with them are crushed out of existence. The price of the articles which are bought by the trusts from the producers are fixed by the trusts, and they are sold at a price fixed by them. Their freight is hauled first and at a lower rate than that of others; they get cut rates on insurance and employ their labor at their own price; their taxes are assessed according to the elasticity of their consciences, and being without heart or soul the coffers of the Government do not overflow from the bounties which they heap into them.

John D. Rockefeller, jr., in an address on "Trusts," to the students of Brown University, used this metaphor:

The American Beauty rose can be produced in its splendor and fragrance only by sacrificing the early buds which grow up around it.

This truly illustrates the voracity of the trusts and with perfection exemplifies the manner in which the Standard Oil trust, the Amalgamated Steel trust, the meat trust, and the numerous other trusts, controlling hundreds of millions of dollars in capital, have gorged themselves with spoils taken from the victims of their inordinate rapacity.

In carrying out their nefarious designs they cajole the courts, they attempt to stock legislative halls with their pliant tools, and with their slimy tentacles are reaching out for the Presidential chair.

A little more than one hundred years ago George Washington died, the richest man in America, beloved by his countrymen and honored by all mankind. In our memory Stephen Girard and Peter Cooper were the richest men of their time; but instead of using their millions to convert happiness into squalid misery they entwined the silken cord of love around the hearts of an affectionate people. Their memory is yet revered and their names will be handed down to the latest generations as emblems of true nobility. They lived before the time when the people bowed down to the god of Mammon and poured forth their adulations at the shrine of the bloated bondholder and the multimillion plutocrat.

"Thou shalt have no other God before me" is not written in the decalogue of the trust magnate of this era; but the golden calf holds the most conspicuous place in his sanctum sanctorum.

Assyria was a most powerful kingdom in ancient times, and the wonderful city of Babylon, with her aqueducts and hanging gardens was the most beautiful city in the world; but their profligacy brought destruction to their splendor and a drunken festival ended the empire.

Greece was a democracy. So long as her people developed a love for literature and art, and were attracted by the real pursuit of happiness she shed a halo of glory throughout the world. But in course of time there arose an aristocracy, which, becoming

as the trust plutocrat of to-day, inflated by grinding the masses, accumulated vast fortunes and by voluptuousness and riotous living degenerated into effeminacy and the nation went into decay, contaminated by the luxury of its men and the immorality of its women.

Rome and Carthage were founded at about the same time. Their Governments were republican in form. Their lights shone as beacons upon the horizon of nations. Their pomp and splendor and grandeur had never been equaled in the history of the world, but their Pandora box was finally opened and the apple of discord was thrown in as they danced with glee to the harp of joy. Riches, power, magnificence drowned every sense of conservatism and, reveling in luxury and debauchery, they crumbled into the ashes of destruction.

There are no more happy or better contented people to-day than those of France. But let us not forget the French revolution. This sickening catastrophe was caused by the tyranny of wealth in its efforts to tighten its coils around the struggling form of an industrious and liberty-loving people.

These people arose in their might and purged the nation of the human vampires who were sucking their lifeblood and deriding the victims of their merciless spoliation.

Three hundred thousand nobles were living in France at the outbreak of the revolution. These nobles imposed most unjust burdens upon the people, and being upheld by church and state there was no arbitrament to which to appeal except the sword. France was deluged in blood! The execution of King, Queen, nobles, women, and children was so awful as to appall, to horrify, the world! Can we learn a lesson from history? Is patriotism dead in this country? Will a reckoning never come? Believe it not! The day is fast approaching when the American people will no longer submit to the human vultures who are preying upon their vitals! The day of deliverance is dawning and will soon shine in its effulgent glory. It will not bring the torch, the sword, or the guillotine, but the voice of the people, which is the voice of God, will be heard! Public servants will be held to the paths of rectitude; pure men will be put in public places; rigorous laws will be enacted and will be rigidly enforced, and great combinations of wealth for illicit purposes will be prohibited. The cornering and monopolizing of the necessities of life will become a high crime and the miscreants who violate the laws will be condemned to solitary confinement, where the specter of their conscience will rise up to lash them. There must be purity in public life. We have a great Navy and a great Army, but what we need is *pure men and pure women*—men and women who can overcome great temptations, who will not be led astray by sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. Such men and such women do not often come from the great cities of the world.

The great men of a nation usually come from the humble fireside, the rustic grove, the shady hillside, the murmuring brook, the waving grain, and the loamy furrow. Here, there is no pollution, no intrigue, no infidelity; but men and women are the imprints of the handiwork of the God of Nature.

Cincinnatus was called from his plow to save Rome, and from the humble homes in the rural districts there will rise up those like Cincinnatus who will dislodge these iniquitous trusts from their strongholds and restore our country to her primitive purity.

Three-fifths of the expenses of the Government are paid by agriculture. There are ninety-five laboring men in this country to every five capitalists—there is no class of laborers which is not organized. The great mass of the people are pure in mind and heart, and by properly cooperating they can control the destinies of this nation. No one class of honest citizens should be arrayed against the other—no legitimate enterprise should antagonize any other, but each should work for the good of the other and all for the welfare of the whole—in this way alone can our happiest dream be realized.

When we want to find purity in its pristine beauty, we go to the country. Charity, in all its generous impulses, abounds there. There, each man who lives a correct life is the equal of all his neighbors. There are no castes, no social scale, no high-fliers, or degraded debauchees. A man is judged for what he is worth. Each joins in the sorrows of the others, and in sickness, trials, or troubles each man leans upon the strong arm of his neighbor, and a sympathetic chord is touched in each manly heart.

Give us the purity of the country hearthstone in our homes, in our courts, in our legislative halls, in our executive chairs, and our Government will go down, resounding through all the ages as the grandest monument ever erected to the liberties of mankind. Then let the manipulators in stocks and bonds and the gamblers in high finance endeavor to bring on a financial crash, the people who own their homes and those pursuing the peaceful avocations of life will bid defiance, and will rejoice

at their emancipation from the thralldom of environments like those with which they are now surrounded. We see the dawn of day in the east, and may God speed the time when the effulgent rays of a noonday sun may beam in their brilliancy over the destinies of a people redeemed from avarice and restored to their love for all that is noble, pure, and good.

Mr. WILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with very great pleasure to the eloquent remarks of the distinguished gentlemen who have just addressed this House, and I find that their utterances have prompted me to express a few thoughts which have been on my mind for some time. My only excuse for presenting these thoughts is, that I am an American citizen and I love my country.

I desire to address my remarks to the first paragraph of the President's message now under discussion.

At the very dawn of our nation's history the citizen was enthroned instead of the ruler. The citizen was made king. Sovereignty was placed in the people and not in governors or Presidents.

This was made possible because of the prevailing contention against arbitrary authority, and this contention is still alive in the breast and brain of every true American battling for the right of the people to govern themselves.

The people are the President; the governor. These are names for their will, their authority, their power, and their agents.

The citizen of no country on earth has so much secured to him as the citizen of this great country.

What he does not possess in State, he has surrendered to acquire greater things in the nation. Nothing can be taken away from him, and there is nothing that he has given up that he can not reclaim; nothing delegated that he can not recall and do himself.

No one has superseded him.

He may rejoice in the proud consciousness that he is the king, the lawmaker, and ruler.

We have drifted so far away from these simple and primary facts of our citizenship that it is desirable and well-nigh imperative to apply the probe of public discussion to them.

One of the duties most binding and one of the privileges most precious to an American citizen is the free discussion of the affairs of his land and country in an orderly, intelligent, and rational manner.

Our foundations were laid in discussion.

Public opinion, which is the final court, makes up its verdict by discussion.

The surest and shortest road to tyranny is by the interdiction of free speech.

Great would be the calamity that would close the minds and voices of our citizens to the fullest and freest discussion of all national and State questions and all Executive actions. The safety of the Republic lies in the fact that every act of the Executive and every act of legislation is sure to be reviewed by the searchlight of unselfish and fearless discussion.

Nothing can be more dangerous to our national liberty and prosperity than an indifferent, careless, and thoughtless acquiescence in existing conditions.

No man has a just claim upon the attention of a thoughtful people who exhibits hostility to the noble institutions of his country or who assails with anarchistic design its chief executives.

In this great country remedies are accomplished not by an assault upon one man, but by persuasion of a majority of the people. No useful purpose is ever served in this country by removing with violence a man who is the choice of a majority. It is the majority we must remove by solid and unanswerable argument.

A silent revolution is thus accomplished; no flying of banners; no bursting of shell; no carnage of battle; no loss of blood, but a fair interchange of thought, a combat of minds, a triumph of reason.

But while the privilege and duty of such discussion is beyond question, all men who discuss our country's affairs must be careful to do so within constitutional limits and in language which a crazy anarchist can not misconstrue.

I have read with great pleasure the opening paragraph of the President's message. I have read it many times. He says:

No nation has greater resources than ours.

And every American rejoices in the consciousness of this fact. He says:

And I think it can be truthfully said that the citizens of no nation possess greater energy and industrial ability.

We gladly clasp him by the hand and say: "We agree with you in this, and we are proud that we are citizens under the Stars and Stripes."

But he says further:

In no nation are the fundamental business conditions sounder than in ours at this very moment; and it is foolish when such is the case for people to hoard money instead of keeping it in sound banks, for it is such hoarding that is the immediate occasion of money stringency. Moreover, as a rule, the business of our people is conducted with honesty and probity, and this applies alike to farms and factories, to railroads and banks, to all our legitimate commercial enterprises.

Mr. Chairman, either our distinguished President is wrong in the multitude of statements he has been making before the American people or this part of the paragraph is foolish optimism.

Mr. Chairman, during the holidays I went back to my home. I met manufacturers, builders, and merchants, and they said to me: "Is there any way you can help us out of our difficulty?" And my talks with them disclosed a financial difficulty of a very serious nature, and I endeavored to assist them through the banks, but without success. The bankers said: "We can give you no assistance; there is a difficulty in our financial system. Our currency affairs are in very bad condition, and we are practically helpless to render aid."

I met men who are conversant with our financial affairs, and I have devoted about two weeks to interviews with the head officials of banking institutions, and my inquiry has been, "What is the trouble, what caused it, and how shall we remedy the conditions?" I have found that some had fine-spun, complicated theories as to the underlying cause of the trouble, but in the final analysis the opinions were practically unanimous that the panic was precipitated by the ill-timed, unwise, and intemperate utterances of our Chief Executive, and that the financial institutions which were not fortified against the storm thus created fell first when attacked. In other words, the banker who was so blind as not to see the necessary national calamity which must inevitably follow an assault upon the very life of our industrial institutions, and therefore did not know his peril, must unquestionably suffer the penalty of this folly.

I have tried not to be hysterical on this question. I have tried to be sane, thoughtful, and deliberate. I have tried to brush aside all prejudice, and I have tried in a simple way, the only way that I can, to deal with this question and designate what, in my opinion, is the cause. My conclusion is, Mr. Chairman, that, after all, the simple proposition is that each one of us has lost confidence in the other. The business man has lost faith in the men with whom he deals. The banker has lost confidence in the business man. A spirit of unrest, indecision, and uncertainty has taken hold upon the people in general. Men entitled to extended credit receive practically none. Why is it?

The friends of the President say you can not blame him because he has simply turned on the light and exhibited the rottenness of our institutions. No, they say, you can not blame him.

A statement has been credited to Baron Rothschild that if the public for the short period of twenty-four hours should lose every confidence in his ability and integrity, he would be bankrupt.

This statement is said to have been made at a time when it was necessary for the rulers of the world to obtain the consent of the great master of finance before entering upon war.

Credit is so delicate a thing that the richest man in the world in those days was absolutely at the mercy of any person with sufficient influence to destroy his reputation for honesty and ability.

The distinction between actual cash and credit is rarely considered.

Business men speak of a cash transaction when they mean that the article sold is to be paid for upon delivery, but certainly it is a transaction only if the payment is made in coin or currency.

Evidently, if the payee receives a check, the transaction is based purely on credit, which is the result of his confidence, first, in the man whose check he receives and, secondly, in the ability of the bank to honor it. Destroy the payee's confidence in either or both of these, and he will accept only cash. Then, and then only, does it become a cash transaction. Ordinarily, however, the business man refers to a credit transaction as one according to which the payment is to be made after a certain time has elapsed, or at some time subsequent to the date of the transaction. Here, of course, a greater amount of confidence is required on the part of the payee or the seller.

Now, let us suppose that by the incendiary speeches of the President the individual's mind becomes filled with forebodings as to the integrity of the persons with whom he has commercial or financial dealings. By a natural mental process he arrives at the conclusion that if those who stand high in the financial world are unworthy of his confidence it will be advisable for

him to proceed with the utmost caution in his dealings in general. That form of credit which is dependent upon the greatest confidence, namely, the time allowance for the payment of bills, is curtailed, and if other events of a disquieting nature succeed one another continually, it is not surprising that the lack of confidence should become so acute that he will refuse to avail himself even of those forms of credit usually characterized as cash transactions, namely, acceptance of checks in lieu of cash. It is then that the period of hysteria commences; that the public clamors at the doors of the banks of the country for their money, and that a general financial panic ensues.

If the German Emperor, for example, should see fit to proclaim throughout the length and breadth of his Empire the dishonesty of the leading members of the financial community in Germany, should he resort to a shorter and uglier word and call them "liars;" should he intimate that they were robbing the people; it would be perfectly natural for the German people to lose confidence in the paper commonly called securities, issued over the signature and over the indorsement of those men, and if they should throw these securities on the market for whatever prices they might bring, there would be nothing unnatural about it; on the contrary, it would be entirely in accord with natural laws. Nothing, therefore, has happened in this country that might not have been expected as the result of the procedure of the President.

In reply to the President's argument, I think it can be safely said that the President has not turned on the light, but that he has turned on gas. The people have not been enlightened but stupefied. He has talked too much. He has gone forth to the American people and made them believe that the men who were running all our industrial institutions are dishonest and are not worthy of their confidence and trust, and therefore confidence and trust have been taken from them and disaster has followed. [Applause.]

I have heard no word from the President denying that he said that "if he had brought on the panic, he was glad of it, as it was coming on anyway," or words to that effect; but we have abundant and reliable authority that he did say it. It certainly was a declaration evidencing an unsafe state of mind. It is like the excuse of a doctor who enters a sick room and says, "I know that the patient is going to die some time, and therefore I will thrust the knife into his heart and get rid of him at once."

I say, Mr. Chairman, that what we need to-day is not so much the spirit of condemnation, to crush them down and destroy and kill, but what we need is the spirit of preservation, to build up and solidify and make firm and true. Why, cheers do a thousand times more good than complaints.

While we emphatically condemn all combinations of capital which have for their main purpose restraint of trade and oppression, we must not forget (to quote from a distinguished author) that "manufacture and commerce are tremendous instruments of civilization, and the accumulation of wealth is the multiplication of man's powers of noble conquest. It is the measure of possibilities in subduing the lands and seas, in the institutions of the state, in education and the church, in the development of the earth's resources and the application of them to the varied demands of mankind. It is a prime equation, when properly used, of civilization and the millennium."

In these times an association of business men stands for something more than the money-getting interest of a great community. It has to do with the expenditures of moneys as well, in the interests of all the people, in sanitation, education, and all forms of thrift and morals. It perhaps is one of the most public-spirited institutions in all the land. Its scope is so wide that it is unembarrassed by any public subject into which one's thought and discussion may range—for its field is the world. For in these days manufacture and commerce are the patron saints of philosophy, art, and letters; of war, peace, and religion; of invention, discovery, and politics. Love of money is the root of all evil; but lawful money-making, the right use of money, and the wisdom of the money-makers are the roots of all practical good, or at least the practical application of all good.

The extent to which manufacture has widened and penetrated all human interests from the plow to the altar reveals the pace of modern thought. It is the way the century has been thinking and moving. It is the faith of the new man pushing on and pushing out. It is irresistible. I suppose the first movements of migration and trade were inspired by physical consideration exclusively. It was to get pasturage for flocks and to find food more abundant. But now civilization is the great goal of manufacture and trade. All forms of business volunteer their offerings to discovery, to science, to the state. We have a new concept, broad, worthy, in which no man is to live for himself. We are to discover not trade alone, but duty and opportunity and the signs of God that shall indicate our place and part in the

mighty struggle to emancipate this world and give it in every part liberty.

Legislate all you choose, you never can make the great men do small things or the small ones do great things. Great men will make small things great and you can not stop it, and you can not by all the laws of the Solons and Numas of the earth make a small man do a great thing. Every man will work in his own order. If we get misplaced, legislation will not place us. We have got to work out our own salvation.

This new doctrine that you can legislate unsuccessful men into success is a piece of imbecility that does injustice to our twentieth century. The man who whines that he has no chance because other men have got the trade can not be helped by law. There will be nothing of him that is not in him nor for him that he does not do for himself.

When a new Cunarder is built we do not begin a protest and investigate because she is too big for the channel of our harbor or because she will bring the passengers of five great ships across the seas and make tramps of the old-time greyhounds and restrain their trade. We dig our channel deeper and build our docks longer and say "Come on! We will dig as deep water as you can draw, and we will float you lengthwise of the North River before we will surrender to anything that man can put upon the ocean!"

We should dig our channels deep for our trade, our manufactures, and inventions, and man should multiply himself a hundredfold for the new and startling capacity demanded by the new age. It is our business to make way for him, to join forces with him, and to welcome him with all of his powers of brain and wealth, for he is working out the gigantic proportions of a new and last civilization.

A lawmaking, court-controlling Executive, a government by commissions, a personal construction of the Constitution, is not a republic.

The trial of business corporations in courts of the Administration by a prosecuting Administration, the arraignment of citizens and their business by name in a condemnatory way, the characterizing of private citizens offensively, and the commenting adversely upon men under indictment waiting trial, unseemly quarrels with the representatives of our highest official positions before an astonished civilized world, and gratuitous attacks upon citizens for their personal opinions and teachings are so opposed to all our dignified traditions and such a menace to our boasted freedom as to justify universal condemnation.

We do not want a Chief Executive going up and down the country condemning and striking everything that shows its head. What we do want is a man performing his duties with dignity, conservatism, and with power and with the influence of all sane men behind him.

It has been said that our President is sincere. He may be, but we want him a sensible President along with his sincerity. When a cook comes to me with a recommendation that she is sincere, I want to know also that she knows how to cook. [Applause.] She may be sincere, but incompetent; and so, what we want is a man in the White House who, when the sum total of his life is made up, has something more than sincerity to commend him. Why, it is elementary that the more sincerely you believe a falsehood the more disastrous it is to you. So mere sincerity does not help; it may be a very dangerous thing. If a schemer comes to you with some sort of a fake gold mine and shows you the golden road to prosperity and a million dollars, if you believe him, and you are so sincere in your belief that you embark every dollar you have in the world in the scheme, and the whole thing goes up in smoke, then you have lost everything; whereas if you had mingled caution with your sincerity, you would not have fared so badly.

Mr. Chairman, in these powerful positions in our nation, we need to-day men who are safe, sane, sensible, conservative, courageous, and true. I stand here to-day to say that many of these qualifications are not possessed by the present occupant of the White House. And I declare that it is my profound conviction that this panic of to-day is due to his lack of sound business sense and his failure to duly appreciate the true condition of our nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I respectfully call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to two articles which appeared in the November and December numbers of the American Business Man, which present in a forceful and vigorous manner the matter now under discussion, and I think it is fair to say disclose the state of mind of the business man in this nation to-day. They are as follows:

THE "SQUARE DEAL," AND DO WE GET IT?

It is generally unjust to blame a panic upon a President, for panics are usually traceable to crop failures or to the uncurbed excesses of the gambling mania or to other conditions beyond the control of a President or his Administration.

But the present panicky feeling which is paralyzing the industries of the country is not due to speculative excesses, else it would have reached its climax nine months ago, when Wall street had its attack of colic. It is not at all due to crop failures, but exists in spite of splendid crops in almost every section of the country.

It is due entirely to the destruction of popular confidence in the honesty and soundness of the fundamental enterprises of the nation, and this destruction of confidence can be traced mainly, if not wholly, to the public utterances of Theodore Roosevelt.

Therefore we say that this present condition of panic, this present cessation of manufacturing, this present dullness of merchandizing, this present paralysis of banking, is properly chargeable to Theodore Roosevelt—to his policy of openly, blatantly denouncing business institutions, and to his practice of publicly wreaking personal vengeance on unfavored individuals.

No one, anywhere, will argue that every kind of business, everywhere, is wrong or rotten or dishonest. No one will cry out that every millionaire is a thief and a scoundrel. Yet conditions could hardly be worse if this were the popular hue and cry. And the whole cause of it all is that Theodore Roosevelt, in his own inflammatory way, has succeeded in upsetting the equilibrium of public confidence, so that the people, everywhere, unable to distinguish the good from the bad, have begun to be convinced that all corporations, banks, railroads, and big business enterprises are unsound and untrustworthy, and have lost their confidence in the fundamental enterprises upon which the business of the nation rests.

We do not question the sincerity of the President. We only deplore his lack of mental balance which is evidenced when he jumps at the conclusion that, since some things are bad, all things must be bad. We only deplore his lack of judgment in exploiting his inmost thoughts to an excitable public before he has had time to mature them in his own mind. We only deplore his ruthlessness in appropriating the powers of the Department of Justice to his own purposes and upsetting the coordinate branches of government which the Constitution was meant to guarantee to us. We only deplore his abortion of the high power with which he is intrusted to petty personal ends.

For it is not enough that a President be sincere. He should be sensible. He should be closemouthed. He should be self-controlled. He should be conservative. Theodore Roosevelt is none of these.

And whatever have been the actuating motives, it can not be denied that the attacks of the big stick have not been attacks on speculation. They have been attacks on industry.

No matter how they have been aimed, they have hurt the gambler less than they have hurt the working business man.

They have not curbed the evils of overcapitalization, but they have shredded and shriveled that very warp and woof of our business fabric—public confidence.

They have not succeeded in making our earnings more safe from the hands of the looter, but they have made it necessary for the railroads to lay off their men by the thousand, for banks to curtail their loans that are the lifeblood of trade, and for businesses everywhere to pause with bated breaths while the fate of a million salaried employees and workmen trembles in the balance.

Under the guise of punishing wrongdoers Theodore Roosevelt has inflamed the public mind into a semisocialism. By his public utterances he has worked up a spirit of unrest and distrust which can produce no good, but only disaster.

He has forgotten the dignity of his position; he has lost sight of his sworn responsibilities in a mad scramble to tear down the business of the nation, which it is his plain duty, instead, to protect.

It is no excuse to argue that there are evils to be corrected and dishonest men to be punished.

There is no possible excuse for the present destruction of public confidence at a time when, in the lap of plenty, we should be reaping the rich rewards of our patient toil. There is no possible excuse for the vengeance and destruction which is being visited on foremost American business enterprises.

That there are evils that there are dishonest men, no one will deny. It could scarcely be otherwise.

But the correction of evil and the punishment of dishonesty are not things to be flaunted in the public eye; are not cases to be tried by the nation's Executive through the public press; are not properly the public themes of a President's political activity.

The Government is provided with a Department of Justice, which includes machinery for the discovery of evils, for the apprehension of criminals, for the collection of evidence, and for fair and impartial trials to all.

The orderly processes of law need no reinforcement by inflammatory appeals to the multitude. And a President of the United States has every facility for starting the wheels of justice without first appealing to the populace to condemn men and institutions in advance of the collection of evidence against them.

It is Theodore Roosevelt's present policy that brands him a dangerous, destructive politician at the nation's head at a time when there is crying need for a conservative, constructive statesman.

The "big stick" is no weapon for a President. Much less, then, personal vilification and blatant abuse!

The method of Theodore Roosevelt is the method of the patent-medicine faker. He shouts our ears full of high-sounding phrases, and by his mannerisms and misleading emphases causes us to assume things which are not true and forces us into false conclusions.

His pet phrase has been "the square deal."

But the square deal dates back before Roosevelt. It is the theme of our Constitution. It was contemplated by John Hancock. It was an active principle in the time of Jefferson. It is an established institution of the United States. It is the whole object of our form of government, and depends not on any arm of the Government, but upon the Government as a whole. It depends upon the Federal courts and upon the Attorney-General. It depends on the Senate and on the House of Representatives. It depends upon the governmental Departments and upon the Cabinet. And, after all, it depends only slightly on the President himself.

Yet, with a blare of trumpets, Theodore Roosevelt would have us believe that he discovered this new golden rule, and that now, and for the first time, it will be put into active practice.

The square deal, indeed!

Is it the square deal when a President of the United States incites the public into a clamor that winds up in panic? Is it the square deal when a President takes cases out of the courts and tries them from the rear platform of his train? Is it the square deal when a President swings and smashes his big stick and tears down industries that took years of patient effort to build up? Is it the square deal

when a President uses his high position for personal vituperation and vilification?

Did that steamboat captain who was discharged by telegraph at the instigation of the President, and who was later at a court of law found guiltless, did he get the square deal?

Does the workman who is thrown out of his job because of dull times which follow this Presidential tirade and talk, does this workman get the square deal?

Is it a square deal for his employer?

And the merchant, the clerk, the superintendent, the bookkeeper, the jobber, the traveling man—every man in business who is made to suffer "along with the guilty"—is theirs the square deal?

Who gets the square deal? The trust does not get it, when its property is confiscated because of a bloodless crime. The railroad does not get it when it is fined \$5,000 for a 45-cent rebate. The bank does not get it when the Presidential destruction of public confidence threatens its safety. The manufacturer, the merchant does not get it. The workman does not get it. And this in a country where without the interference of the President the square deal would be a mechanical, an automatic fact!

If "my policies" are permitted to continue, the time is now in sight when the acute issue will be the Square Deal *v.* the Square Meal.

THE TOLLERS AND THE SPOILER.

Every man who ever earned a dollar; every man who, by toil and patient effort, has built up a business or won for himself a responsible position; every man who has money in the bank or a home to live in; every man in business, whether he be employer or employee, should take heed. For we face a national danger that threatens to stop our earnings and wipe out our savings; that threatens to cut off our weekly pay envelopes; that threatens to throw us into a chaos of hard times. It is the danger of the Big Stick.

We live in a splendidly prosperous country. But our prosperity was not gained in a night. It was earned by long years of patient effort. It was won by decades of struggle for world markets. It was brought about through the concerted energy of the farmer, the oil man, the steel man, the manufacturer, the miner, the merchant. It was made possible largely by the railroads.

Now the spoiler is abroad in this land of tollers. The Big Stick is his weapon. And his purpose is not to build up, but to tear down. Not to correct and to help, but to wreak vengeance, and to destroy.

We have not always been a rich or a prosperous nation. The time was, not many years ago, when we were poor—very poor. The time was when our national enterprise was not running smoothly; when, instead of having an annual profit, we were draining our own resources to pay our mere living expenses. Those were the days when individual successes were difficult and rare; when a fortune of \$50,000 was a fortune, indeed.

And now?

And now, that we are basking in the sunshine of plenty, we are asked to applaud the crack of the Big Stick as it cripples a railroad. We are asked to howl our approval at the sight of a trust in distress. Now, that we have gained a firm footing in finance, we are commanded to clap our hands in glee at a smashing blow intended to paralyze our whole system of business nerves.

It is not a Wall street peril that we discuss. It is a business peril. It is a peril which hovers over the national banks of the Dakotas and makes it hard for the farmers to borrow money on their wheat. It is a peril which menaces the steel industries of Pennsylvania. It is a peril which threatens the output of every factory, the sales of every store, the income of every man in business, great or small.

For the Big Stick chooses as its targets those fundamental enterprises which are the foundation stones of every business everywhere.

When it threatens the railroads it threatens you. When it threatens the financial security of the country it threatens your prosperity, your success, your job. When it threatens to dissolve a trust and confiscate a fortune it threatens, too, to dissolve your means of livelihood and confiscate your savings.

It is no argument to say that there are evils to be corrected.

There are.

But the Big Stick seeks not to correct. It seeks to destroy.

Does your roof leak? Tear down the house! Have you a dishonest bookkeeper? Discharge every employee! Are you overstocked? Burn your store! That is not the way to succeed in business. That is not the correction of evil—it is destruction. But that is the policy which actuates the Big Stick.

Has a trust been guilty of an unfair act? Forget the fact that that trust has won a world market that pours us in a mint of money. Forget the fact that in a thousand ways that trust performs a useful service. Forget the fact that its life is the life of a thousand enterprises that it carries and nurses and feeds. Forget everything! Dissolve it! Take away its charter! Kill it! Destroy it!

That is the argument of the Big Stick.

Is there a railroad caught in some petty larcency? Tear up its tracks! Burn its ties! No matter that with the fates of that railroad will rise and fall the fates of a hundred communities, a thousand factories, and ten thousand farms! Paralyze it! Smash it! Destroy it!

Is there a packer who needs the stern hand of some city official to make him clean up his killing-room floor? Ah! It is a national issue! Publish the filth! Ruin his hard-earned foreign market! Nauseate the whole human race! Swing the Big Stick and destroy!

Is there a man who dares to differ? Brand him a faker! Call him a liar! Besmut him! Befoul him! Disgrace him! Destroy him!

The danger that imperils us, this danger of the Big Stick, is that it appeals to the credulity that is in us. It whispers suspicions to us. It sows the seed of unrest. It poisons our minds with polite anarchy and socialism. It is recommended as a corrector of evil, when, in reality, it is but a destroyer of everything. It presents itself as the chastening rod of a dutiful parent, when it is but the weapon of a wild man seeking popular notoriety.

There are persons who constantly clamor. They complain of oppression, speculation, and the pernicious influence of accumulated wealth. They cry out loudly against all banks and corporations and all means by which small capitals become united in order to produce important and beneficial results. They carry on mad hostility against all established institutions. They would choke the fountain of industry and dry all the streams. In a country of unbounded liberty they clamor against oppression. In a country of perfect equality they would move heaven and earth against privilege and monopoly. In a country where property is more evenly divided than anywhere else they rend the air shouting agrarian doctrines. In a country where the wages

of labor are high beyond parallel they would teach the laborer that he is but an oppressed slave.

Does this not sound as if it might have been written yesterday? Does not the germ of truth it contains seem to apply peculiarly, and only, to conditions which confront us to-day?

It is an extract from a public speech of Daniel Webster, delivered in the United States Senate in 1838.

Who is it that incites the people to clamor?

Is it the day laborer, the workman in the factory, on the farm, in the mine? No. He is content. His clamor is no louder than might reasonably be expected in any ordinary times. He is not the man who urges the Big Stick onward in its skull-crashing mission.

Is it the manufacturer, the merchant, the banker? Ah, no! His sigh is to be left in peace to enjoy the prosperity that his efforts have earned.

Is it the oil man, the steel man, the packer, the railroad? Hardly! The whole present clamor is the inspiration of the politician. Not the ward heeler, not the political boss, but the master politician himself.

The present unrest is inspired by the public utterances of the President of the land.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I feel impelled to say: "Let our distinguished President study Washington's farewell address as a caution against the misuse of the Constitution; study Lincoln's mighty faith and superb patience and his charity for all; study McKinley's philosophical, practical, sound sense and give the people a rest. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether there is any other member of the committee who desires to speak. There does not seem to be anybody rising from his seat to take the floor. Therefore I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OVERSTREET, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House resolution 43, providing for the distribution of the President's message, and had come to no resolution thereon.

JUVENILE COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report by Judge William H. DeLacy of the first year's operations of the juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 6, 1908.

The message, with accompanying documents, was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GUANICA CENTRAL AND MUNICIPALITY OF CAYEY, PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In accordance with section 32 of an act of Congress entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900, I transmit herewith certified copies of franchises, granted by the executive council of Porto Rico to Guanica Central and to the municipality of Cayey. THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 7, 1908.

The message, with accompanying documents, was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES, SIXTIETH CONGRESS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLERK'S OFFICE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 4, 1907.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives a list of contests for seats in the House of Representatives for the Sixtieth Congress of the United States, notices of which have been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House, and also transmit therewith all original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto, as follows:

No. 3—State of Illinois.—Fifth District, Eighth District.

No. 1—State of South Carolina.—First District, Second District, Seventh District.

No. 2—Territory of New Mexico.

The Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in all of the above cases, excepting in the case of Anthony Michalek and Adolph J. Sabath, of the Fifth Illinois District, in which case testimony having been taken by the contestant only, and was not delivered to this office until October 3, 1907, and for this reason was not opened or printed; and also in the case of Stanley H. Kunz and Charles McGavin, of the Eighth Illinois District, wherein both the contestant and the contestee agreed to and abide by the result of a recount of the actual ballots cast, and which showed that Charles McGavin was duly elected.

In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1897, entitled "An act relating to contested elections," such portions of the testimony in the above cases as the parties in interest agreed upon or as seemed proper to the Clerk, except as above noted, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed, together with the notices of contest and the answers thereto, and such portions of the testimony as were not printed with the original papers have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections.

Two copies of the printed testimony in each case have been mailed to the contestant and the same number to the contestee. The law in reference to the briefs of both the contestant and contestee in each case has been complied with as far as possible upon receipt by the Clerk of said briefs.

So far as the briefs have been furnished to the Clerk, they are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections upon the order of the House, together with a tabulated statement, which has been prepared by the Clerk, showing the number of pages of testimony and the present status of each contested-election case and all papers in connection therewith.

Very respectfully,

A. McDOWELL,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

HON. JOSEPH G. CANNON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

District.	Contestant.	Contestee.	Testimony opened.	Testimony printed.	Printed pages of testimony and briefs.		
					Testimony.	Briefs.	Total.
Fifth Illinois.....	Anthony Michalek.....	Adolph J. Sabath.....	June 20, 1907.....
Eighth Illinois.....	Stanley H. Kunz.....	Charles McGavin.....	Sept. 7, 1907.....	89	89
First South Carolina.....	Aaron P. Prioleau.....	George S. Legare.....	July 23, 1907.....	Sept. 4, 1907.....	88	83	171
Second South Carolina.....	Isaac Myers.....	J. O. Patterson.....do.....	Aug. 27, 1907.....	65	54	119
Seventh South Carolina.....	A. D. Dantzer.....	A. F. Lever.....do.....	Aug. 13, 1907.....	55	59	114
Territory of New Mexico.....	O. A. Larrazolo.....	W. H. Andrews.....	June 18, 1907.....	1,021	247	1,268
Total.....	1,318	443	1,761

District.	Contestant.	Contestee.	Contestant notified to file brief.	Contestant's brief filed.	Contestee notified to file brief.	Contestee's brief filed.	Contestee's brief sent to contestant.	Contestant's reply brief filed.
Fifth Illinois.....	Anthony Michalek.....	Adolph J. Sabath.....
Eighth Illinois.....	Stanley H. Kunz.....	Charles McGavin.....	Sept. 7, 1907.....	Oct. 8, 1907.....	Oct. 8, 1907.....	Nov. 9, 1907.....	Nov. 9, 1907.....
First South Carolina.....	Aaron P. Prioleau.....	George S. Legare.....	Sept. 4, 1907.....	Oct. 15, 1907.....	Oct. 15, 1907.....	Nov. 11, 1907.....	Nov. 11, 1907.....
Second South Carolina.....	Isaac Myers.....	J. O. Patterson.....do.....do.....do.....	Nov. 22, 1907.....	Nov. 22, 1907.....
Seventh South Carolina.....	A. D. Dantzer.....	A. F. Lever.....	Aug. 27, 1907.....	Sept. 17, 1907.....	Sept. 17, 1907.....	Oct. 17, 1907.....	Oct. 17, 1907.....	Nov. 21, 1907
Territory of New Mexico.....	O. A. Larrazolo.....	W. H. Andrews.....	Aug. 13, 1907.....

The SPEAKER. The Chair assigns these cases to the respective committees according to the memorandum on the first page, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To Committee on Elections No. 1, State of South Carolina, First District, Second District, Seventh District.

To Committee on Elections No. 2, Territory of New Mexico.

To Committee on Elections No. 3, State of Illinois, Fifth District, Eighth District.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MEYER, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I do not see in the House at this moment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moon],

chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws. I have had some consultation with him, and he tells me that the Criminal Code has been reported by that committee and will be in print and ready for consideration to-morrow morning, and he is quite desirous that consideration of it be had at that time. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order to call up that bill to-morrow immediately after the disposition of the business upon the Speaker's table, and that it be in order for the day, the House to make such disposition of it as it desires after that; or it may go on as unfinished business.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, pending that, I understand that this debate we have had on the President's message will just simply be suspended until we get through with the other thing.

Mr. PAYNE. We have not disposed of the resolution, and

it will be necessary to go into the Committee of the Whole again whenever there is an opportunity in the House, which I think will occur before a great while.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to know a little more about what that is before we assign a particular date, and I object.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

A letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting his report for the year 1907—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting detailed statement of expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1907, and estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908—to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 186) to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Army, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 20), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 194) to authorize the county of St. Francis, in the State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across St. Francis River at or near the town of Madison, in said county and State, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LOVERING, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 251) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the city of St. Louis, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Missouri, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River," approved February 6, 1907, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 11), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3932) to authorize the court of county commissioners of Geneva County, Ala., to construct a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River in Geneva County, about 6 miles above the town of Geneva, Ala., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 12), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4891) to authorize the city of Burlington, Iowa, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 13), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7618) to authorize the Benton Water Company, its successors or assigns, to construct a dam across the Snake River, in the State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 14), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9210) to authorize the court of county commissioners of Geneva County, Ala., to construct a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River at or near the Jones Old Ferry, in Geneva County, Ala., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 15), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10519) to authorize the Nashville and Northeastern

Railroad Company to construct a bridge across Cumberland River at Celina, Tenn., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 16), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11330) to authorize the Chicago, Indiana and Southern Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Grand Calumet River in the town of Gary, Ind., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 17), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11331) to authorize the Baltimore and Ohio and Chicago Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Grand Calumet River in the town of Gary, Ind., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 18), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9121) to authorize a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Council Bluffs, Iowa, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 21), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk, and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. HASKINS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5354) for the relief of the Columbia National Bank, of Columbia, Pa., reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 7), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6450) for the relief of William Bushby, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 8), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7833) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the St. Louis Hay and Grain Company, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 9), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10383) for the relief of the heirs of Edmund Wolf, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 10), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6082) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the military record of Bernhard Steuber, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 19), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 2998) granting a pension to Amanda Hoover—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4932) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Moore—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 9908) granting a pension to Henry C. Snyder—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12397) to rectify the boundary line of Rock Creek Park—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 12398) to authorize the War Department to transfer to the State of Kansas certain land now a part of the Fort Riley Military Reservation—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 12399) providing for the establishment of a system of local rural parcel post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 12400) to amend the regula-

tions governing the National Military Home at Washington, D. C., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 12401) to legalize a bridge across the Mississippi River at Rice, Minn.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 12402) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes," approved January 21, 1903—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12403) to amend section 876 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 12404) to authorize the Court of Claims to admit as evidence affidavits in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 12405) to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in buildings, ships, navy-yards, parks and other premises owned or used by the United States Government—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12406) to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in buildings and upon premises owned or controlled by the United States Government—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12407) to prevent the desecration of the American flag—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12408) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the extension of Meridian place NW., approved January 9, 1907—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 12409) making an appropriation for a public building at Shamokin, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12410) providing for the appointment of an assistant treasurer of the United States at the city of Seattle, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 12411) to require clerks of the courts of record of the United States to keep a public record to be called a judgment docket, prescribing its nature and contents, and providing for the taxation of fees for the services of the clerks—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 12412) to authorize the Missouri and North Arkansas Railroad Company to construct a bridge across Cache River in Woodruff County, Ark.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12413) appropriating \$30,000 for the improvement of the Yaquina River, Oregon, from Yaquina to Toledo—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 12414) to provide for the purchase of additional ground and the enlargement and improvement of the public building at Beaver Falls, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 12415) to extend Fourth street SE. from Congress Heights to Washington Highlands, District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GODWIN: A bill (H. R. 12416) to provide for the purchase of a site for the erection of a custom-house and Federal court building thereon at Wilmington, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12417) to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the State of North Carolina—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 12418) to provide for the distribution of the reports of the United States circuit court of appeals and of the circuit and district courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12419) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to purchasers of Indian lands under any law now existing or hereafter enacted—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 12420) to extend immediate transportation privileges to the support of Alburg in the customs collection district of Vermont—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 12421) providing for a certain percentage of cancellation of stamps, and making an allowance for rents, fuel, and lights, etc., to fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12422) to provide for a final settlement with the Nuc-que-clah-we-muck tribe of Indians, of Oregon, for lands ceded by said Indians to the United States in a certain unratified treaty between said parties, dated August 7, 1851—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12423) to provide for a final settlement with the Kathlamet band of Chinook-Indians, of Oregon, for lands ceded by said Indians to the United States in a certain unratified treaty between said parties, dated August 9, 1851—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 12424) to authorize the President to appoint a commissioner to settle the boundary lines between the Territory of New Mexico and the State of Oklahoma and the State of Texas, in conjunction with a commissioner appointed by the State of Texas, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 12425) to reorganize the Navy Department of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12426) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations for the better control in said District of markets and other places where foods are sold, and of laundries and other similar places, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12427) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of New Hampshire avenue, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1907—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 12428) to provide for urgent repairs and construction at the immigration station at Ellis Island, New York—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 12429) to remove the import tax duty from iron ore, iron in pigs, and bar iron—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 12430) authorizing the construction of a buoy station at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 12431) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to the compensation of national bank examiners—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOEBEL: A bill (H. R. 12432) authorizing the consolidation of and evidence in actions for libel—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12433) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge in and for the southern judicial district of the State of West Virginia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 12434) to establish a subtreasury at the city of St. Paul, Minn.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12435) to rectify the boundary line of Rock Creek Park—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 12436) to authorize the President to confer brevet rank on certain officers of the United States Army for gallant services in the war with Spain and subsequent insurrection in the Philippines—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 12437) for the erection of a Federal jail at Little Rock, Ark.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12438) extending the time limit for the completion of the lines of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 12439) authorizing the construction of a bridge across White River, Arkansas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 12440) to amend the Bowman Act, Volume XXII, Statutes at Large, page 485—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12441) to regulate the practice in criminal cases in the United States district and circuit courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 12442) to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at or near Bountiful, Davis County, Utah—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUFF: Resolution (H. Res. 119) authorizing the Committee on Mines and Mining to inquire into and report to the House the causes of the recent mine accidents in the coal regions of the United States—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GILL: Resolution (H. Res. 120) requesting information from the Secretary of the Navy concerning the appointment of Surg. Charles F. Stokes as commander of hospital ship *Relief*, and so forth—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: Resolution (H. Res. 121) for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11701—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCOTT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) to amend act of March 4, 1907, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and so forth—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILHAMS: Concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 18) for the survey of a ship canal from Toledo to Chicago, Ill.—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 12443) granting an increase of pension to John Metz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12444) granting an increase of pension to Mary McNally—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12445) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Coty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12446) granting an increase of pension to Henry Meiners—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12447) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Duffey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12448) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. McCabe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12449) for the relief of R. P. Burhaus—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12450) granting a pension to Ella J. Crosse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 12451) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Hickey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12452) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Wiley Franks, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 12453) granting a pension to Reuben S. Wordwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 12454) granting a pension to Tracy Douglas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELL: A bill (H. R. 12455) granting an increase of pension to Martha Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12456) granting a pension to Isador Strumpf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 12457) granting a pension to Henry Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12458) granting a pension to William May—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12459) granting an increase of pension to J. F. M. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12460) granting an increase of pension to William O. Lamons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12461) granting an increase of pension to Anthony C. Peltier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12462) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Cornett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12463) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Sellers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12464) granting an increase of pension to George E. Simons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12465) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas Earls—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12466) to remove the charge of desertion against Jonathan Large—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12467) to remove the charge of desertion against J. N. McKinnis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 12468) for the relief of Charles W. Fowler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 12469) granting a pension to Joseph S. Ashby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12470) granting a pension to Madison M. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12471) granting a pension to John W. Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12472) granting a pension to Josiah T. McKee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12473) granting pensions to ex-prisoners of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12474) for the relief of James Tulley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12475) to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents" to the surviving officers and

enlisted men of Captain Beaty's company of independent scouts and to their widows and minor children—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 12476) to place the name of William S. Shacklette on the retired list of the Navy as pharmacist—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOK of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12477) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Dewald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: A bill (H. R. 12478) granting a pension to Salina E. West—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12479) granting an increase of pension to Robert Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12480) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Coward—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12481) for the relief of Thomas Monteith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12482) for the relief of the heirs at law of Robert D. McCombs, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12483) to complete the military record of Robert M. Boyd, of North Carolina—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 12484) for the relief of the Citizens' Bank of Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 12485) granting a pension to Nancy Stoops—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12486) granting a pension to Cleo Grady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12487) granting a pension to M. J. Van Eaton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12488) granting a pension to Daniel E. Bavis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12489) for the relief of Mrs. V. E. Sikes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 12490) granting an increase of pension to John Wagner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12491) granting an increase of pension to Griffith T. Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 12492) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 12493) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12494) granting an increase of pension to John A. Speck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12495) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Erb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12496) granting an increase of pension to Henry Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12497) granting a pension to James C. Megahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12498) for the relief of Elishama Beaty—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12499) for the relief of Clarence Frederick Chapman, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 12500) granting an increase of pension to Elihu Kingsby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12501) granting an increase of pension to Royal Sanderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12502) granting an increase of pension to Albert J. Simonds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12503) granting an increase of pension to William C. Weeks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12504) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rooney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12505) granting an increase of pension to H. D. Ayres—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12506) granting an increase of pension to Joel B. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12507) granting an increase of pension to Charles Lamay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12508) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Ayres—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12509) granting an increase of pension to Mary Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12510) granting an increase of pension to John N. Shermerhorn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12511) granting a pension to Persis A. Gowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOULKROD: A bill (H. R. 12512) for the relief of the persons who sustained damage by explosion near Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 12513) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Merchant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12514) granting a pension to Jacob Mays—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12515) granting an increase of pension to James Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILHAMS: A bill (H. R. 12516) to correct the military record of Andrew K. Hite—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12517) to correct the military record of Elisha O. Huss—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12518) for the relief of the estate of J. Calvin Kinney, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOEBEL: A bill (H. R. 12519) granting an increase of pension to Julius Reno—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12520) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wedig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12521) granting an increase of pension to Henry Cash—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.*

By Mr. HAGGOTT: A bill (H. R. 12522) granting a pension to David A. Kenyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12523) granting an increase of pension to William L. Imes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12524) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12525) granting an increase of pension to E. V. R. Colton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12526) granting an increase of pension to Samuel McCain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12527) granting an increase of pension to Charles Roden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 12528) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Truxel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 12529) granting an increase of pension to Lucretia A. Evans—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 12530) for the relief of the heirs of James F. Rinker, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 12531) granting an honorable discharge certificate to Jasper J. Henry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12532) granting an increase of pension to George C. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12533) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Lyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12534) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12535) granting an increase of pension to Edward Souther—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12536) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Cornell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12537) to correct the military record of James Walker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 12538) granting an increase of pension to Margaret F. Harris—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12539) granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Elmore—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12540) granting an increase of pension to M. E. Lewis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12541) to pay to the estate of John M. Ellington, deceased, the sum of \$7,755 for stores and supplies—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12542) for the relief of J. I. Cotney—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12543) for the relief of the heirs of John L. Hayes, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 12544) granting an increase of pension to Combs Hendrickson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12545) granting an increase of pension to Green Yeiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12546) granting an increase of pension to Horace H. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12547) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lingle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 12548) for the relief of A. A. Noon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12549) to reimburse George W. Young, postmaster at Wanship, Utah, for loss of postage stamps—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12550) granting a pension to Charles E. Strother—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12551) granting a pension to Will P. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12552) granting a pension to Melvina J. Swiger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12553) granting an increase of pension to John R. Bungard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 12554) granting a pension to George W. Pack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12555) granting an increase of pension to Hugh McMaster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 12556) for the relief of the estate of Esidore Cohn, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12557) for the relief of the estate of Richard A. Bynum—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12558) for the relief of Henry Tull, heir at law and distributee of the late John Tull—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12559) for the relief of Dorsey S. De Loatch—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12560) for the relief of the heirs of W. H. Padrick, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 12561) granting an increase of pension to Aurelia E. Willard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 12562) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12563) granting an increase of pension to Maria E. Ackert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12564) granting an increase of pension to John D. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12565) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Sprague Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 12566) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Chauncey M. Allard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 12567) granting an increase of pension to George J. Baltzell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 12568) for the relief of Sarah Spaulding—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 12569) to authorize the United States Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries to convey certain lands to Joseph S. Fay, Jr., Sarah B. Fay, and Henry H. Fay—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12570) to grant jurisdiction and authority to the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of Jacob B. Phillips against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 12571) granting an increase of pension to Richard Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12572) granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12573) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NYE: A bill (H. R. 12574) granting a pension to Martha E. Libby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 12575) for the relief of Henry A. V. Post—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 12576) for the relief of John C. Colwell, captain, on the retired list of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 12577) granting an increase of pension to Florence L. M. Mentz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 12578) for the relief of Agnes Berry Crawford, sole heir of Otho Williams, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 12579) for the relief of Mrs. Octave Simoneaux—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 12580) granting a pension to Effa M. Rule—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDALL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 12581) for

the relief of Washington West—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12582) for the relief of heirs of Mrs. Mary A. Meredith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12583) for the relief of Evelyn Clark—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12584) for the relief of the estate of Mason Pilcher, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12585) for the relief of the estate of Henrietta Bauers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12586) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the heirs of Adeliza P. Quays, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12587) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Charity M. Locke, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12588) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Stephen D. Clark—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 12589) granting an increase of pension to William Fosler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12590) granting an increase of pension to James B. Kenner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12591) granting an increase of pension to William H. Lowry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12592) granting an increase of pension to William B. Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12593) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Schroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12594) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Carlisle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12595) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bolner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 12596) granting a pension to Hulda Flinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12597) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McNulty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 12598) granting a pension to Mollie J. Kincheloe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12599) granting a pension to Charity E. Boman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12600) granting a pension to John Taylor Winbery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12601) for the relief of Eli G. Collier—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12602) for the relief of George Byerly—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12603) for the relief of Amasa and Edgar Bernard and the legal representatives of the estate of Susan E. White—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 12604) granting a pension to John N. Moeller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 12605) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Barnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12606) granting a pension to Sarah Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 12607) for the relief of Celestine Villeman, administratrix of the estate of Michael Villeman, deceased—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 12608) granting a pension to Belle E. Secrist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12609) granting a pension to Mary Jane Tillman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12610) granting a pension to Elbert W. McLaughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12611) granting a pension to Margaret Dunn Aston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12612) granting an increase of pension to Alice I. Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12613) granting an increase of pension to John Love—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12614) granting an increase of pension to Bert O. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12615) to correct the military record of Henry P. Kinney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12616) granting an increase of pension to Horace A. Rexford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12617) granting an increase of pension to George W. Button—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12618) granting an increase of pension to T. W. Gilbey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 12619) granting a pension to Hannah M. Crowley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 12620) for the relief of William Denham, of Crookston, Minn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12621) to correct the war record of Eugene Dady—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 12622) to protect the rights of James A. Cummins and his children, Choctaw Indians by blood—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12623) to protect the rights of Bartlett Duke, Nancy K. Luther, Andrew J. Dukes, Thomas P. Dukes, and their descendants—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12624) to protect the rights of John Scarborough and his descendants and Margaret Saunders, Choctaw Indians by blood—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12625) to protect the rights of Mary C. Pettit and descendants, Choctaw Indians by blood—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12626) to protect the rights of Wincle Riddle and her daughter, Mary Arthur, and children, Choctaw Indians by blood—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 12627) granting an increase of pension to Olga H. Updegraff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12628) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Batrim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12629) granting an increase of pension to Albert Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12630) granting an increase of pension to John W. Sherman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12631) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Rinehart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12632) granting an increase of pension to William F. Davison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12633) granting a pension to George W. Newman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 12634) for the relief of W. T. Hawkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WASHBURN: A bill (H. R. 12635) granting a pension to Elizabeth G. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12636) granting a pension to Delia E. Ahern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12637) granting an increase of pension to Charles Clafin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 12638) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Fouce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12639) granting an increase of pension to B. O. Flinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12640) granting an increase of pension to Job Musgrave—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12641) granting an increase of pension to James B. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12642) granting an increase of pension to Drury Badgley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12643) granting an increase of pension to William Satow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12644) granting an increase of pension to Eli W. Metcalf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12645) granting a pension to Oma Harshbarger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12646) granting a pension to Dora Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of George B. Chapman, favoring Dawes bill, creating volunteer civil war officers' retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of D. L. Ambron, of Canton, Ill., for a volunteer retired list of officers of the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of W. T. Harlan, of Greenville, Ill., and S. W. Thurber, favoring passage of Hamilton bill, to pension ex-prisoners of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Charles B. Rowell, for medals for soldiers of the storming column at Port Hudson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Business Men's Association of St. Louis, Mo., for legislation in behalf of the deep-waterways project—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of Missouri: Petition of Missouri Retail Merchants' Association, for revision of the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Rhoda F. Thogmartin and Lewis N. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of soldiers of Ohio, for the Sherwood bill, giving all veteran soldiers \$1 per day—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Ellen E. Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Petition of Navigation Conference for national harbor of refuge at Point Judith, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles W. Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of National Association of Audubon Societies, for appropriation to continue Bureau of Biological Survey, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Navigation Conference, for harbor of refuge at Point Judith, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COCKRAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jacob Palmer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOK: Petition of National Association of Audubon Societies, for an appropriation to support the Bureau of Biology—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of Aug. Wentz Post, No. 1, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring increase of widow's pensions (the Lafean bill)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Chicago Association of Commerce, favoring amendment of the consular law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of National Association of State Universities, for acquiring of a national forest reserve in the Appalachian and White mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Alonzo Myers and Conrad Seim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of W. W. Wall—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. V. E. Sikes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Alfred P. Slater—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a petition of New York State Woman's Suffrage Association, for constitutional amendment against disfranchisement of citizens on account of sex—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Chicago Association of Commerce, for legislation to improve consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of National Association of Audubon Societies, for appropriation to continue Biological Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York, for the improvement of channel of Pearl Harbor, Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Starr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James L. Stevens—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany bills for relief of M. H. Crouse, George C. Gutelius, Jacob A. Hetrick, George W. Isett, Mary A. M. W. Kennedy, Catharine C. Loy, Elizabeth Sheaffer, Mary E. Vandling, Henry S. Rider, and Samuel F. Rupert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of New Mexico Statehood League, for admission of New Mexico to statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles H. Merchant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEBEL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Cash—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of North Side Board of Trade of the city of New York, for appropriation to provide for building a light and fog-signal station at Negro Point, Wards Island—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of A. R. Mackey, against the

Littlefield antiplotage bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of National Association of Retail Druggists, against parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of National Association of Audubon Societies, urging appropriation for support of a Bureau of Biology—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Chicago Association of Commerce, for legislation additional to H. R. 1345, of the Fifty-ninth Congress, looking to betterment of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Fremont, Iowa, against parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of Navigation Conference, for harbor of refuge at Point Judith, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Farmers' National Congress, for parcels-post law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of J. T. Kingsbury and others, of State Normal School, for governmental assistance to normal schools for purpose of giving courses in agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Utah State Council of Women, for amendment to Constitution prohibiting disfranchisement of citizens on account of sex—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Chamber of Mines, for legislation exempting owners of mines from the annual assessment work on their locations for 1907—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of Eureka Council, No. 1136, Knights of Labor, of Columbus, against change of laws relative to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth Cornell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Union, Oreg., for enactment of the Littlefield bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HAYES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Harvey Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of San Francisco, against extension of parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Edward Souther—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, for appropriation to build several submarine torpedo boats for Pacific coast—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of G. G. Sanches, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Navigation Conference, for a harbor of refuge at Point Judith, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Good Templars Lodge No. 10, of San Francisco, for prohibition of liquor in District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Pacific Coast Hardware Association, California Retail Grocers, and California Retail Hardware Dealers, against parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of certain officers of Second Louisiana Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of San Francisco, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of George C. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of A. C. Kugel, Omaha Central Labor Union, for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of National Association of Retail Druggists, against parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of National Association of Audubon Societies, for appropriation to continue Bureau of Biological Survey—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of W. W. Fairbairn, Alanson, Mich., against parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Michigan, urging prohibition of liquor selling in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of Eskridge, Kans., against parcels-post legislation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bills for relief of John R. Hickman, estate of John Easley, Louisa J. Hill, Larkin Cardin, John C. Wiley, Henry Garner, and E. J. B. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of Sacramento Valley Development Association, for appropriation to irrigate lands in California—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of Musicians' Protective Union, against employment of enlisted musicians of the Army and Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Stockton Chamber of Commerce, for more liberal appropriations for Agricultural Department—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Madera, Cal., for restoration of motto "In God we trust" to the coins—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of Sacramento Valley Development Association for appropriation to further work of Bureau of Soils—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Honolulu Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade of San Francisco, for widening and deepening Pearl Harbor, Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of William G. Walters, against reduction of pension agencies—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of San Jose Chamber of Commerce, for deepening and widening Pearl Harbor, Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Santa Cruz Council, No. 971, Knights of Columbus, against modification or classification of second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of California State Board of Trade and Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, for widening and deepening Pearl Harbor, Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, for appropriation to construct a number of submarine torpedo boats for Pacific coast defense—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, against parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of city council of Los Angeles, Cal., for increase of salaries in Army and Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of R. E. McCook Post, No. 28, Department of California, and Nevada Grand Army of the Republic, for increase of pension of widows to \$12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of California Creamery Operators' Association, for inspection of dairy products, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of San Francisco board of police commissioners, for reestablishment of the army canteen at Soldiers' Homes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Board of Trade of San Francisco, for legislation to improve the currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of landowners, farmers, and producers of California, favoring legislation permitting increased immigration of Asiatic laborers—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NYE: Petition of Presbyterian Brotherhood of Bethany Presbyterian Church, of Minneapolis, Minn., for the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Corps, Army and Navy Union, for increase of pay to officers and men of the Army, Navy, etc.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of National German Alliance, against H. R. 9086, prohibition of liquor selling in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLCOTT: Petition of Audubon Society, for appropriation to continue Bureau of Biological Survey—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEARRE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry T. Deavers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana: Papers to accompany bills for relief of estate of Henrietta Bauers and Evelyn Clark—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Mason Pilcher—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John N. Moeller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of Audubon Association, for appropriation to continue Biological Survey—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Navigation Conference, for harbor of refuge at Point Judith, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Michael Vileman—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers to accompany bill to rectify boundary line of Rock Creek Park—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of Business Men of North Branch, Minn., against parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. T. Hawkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Audubon Association, for appropriation for Biological Survey—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of commissioners of agriculture of Southern States, for Biological Survey—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WASHBURN: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Charles Claffin, Della E. Ahern, and Elizabeth G. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 8, 1908.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BRIDGE ACROSS SNAKE RIVER, WASHINGTON.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7618) to authorize the Benton Water Company, its successors or assigns, to construct a dam across the Snake River, in the State of Washington.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman to explain it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. This bill has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and is in the usual form of these bills providing for the construction of dams in accordance with a bill which we passed some time ago. It is a unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It provides for a dam where?

Mr. JONES of Washington. On the Snake River in the State of Washington.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have some information on that matter which will call upon me to object until I can look into it further. I shall object at present.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. PEARRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a change of reference of the bill (H. R. 10205) for the relief of Louis A. Yorke, from the Committee on Military Affairs to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that under the rule the Committee on Military Affairs can change the reference of this bill by indorsing it and placing it in the basket. But since it is now before the House, there is no objection to its taking this course. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 251) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the city of St. Louis, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Missouri, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River," approved February 6, 1907.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. I understand this bill has been reported by the committee?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. It is reported unanimously from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.